CONTENTS

Vol. XXVII, No. 3, April, 1958

Time in Experience and Science	Herbert Dingle	231
Milton in French Literature of the Nineteenth Century	Florence Brinkley	243
Ancient Egyptian Folk Tales	Ronald J. Williams	256
Willa Cather's Portrait of the Artist	Edward A. Bloom Lillian D. Bloom	273
A Paris Theatre in the Eighteenth Century	John Lough	289

QUEBEC TODAY

Introduction	F. C. A. Jeanneret	307
Aspects of French-Canadian Nationalism	Jean-Marc Léger	310
The Economy of Quebec	Pierre Harvey	330
French Canadians and Democracy	Arthur Maheux	341
Political Parties in Quebec	Gérard Bergeron	352
The Trade-Union Movement in Quebec	Gérard Dion	369
Culture in Quebec Today	Jean-Charles Bonenfant	386
Education in Quebec	Charles Bilodeau	398

COPYRIGHT ©, CANADA, 1958
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE IN WHOLE OR IN PART MUST BE OBTAINED IN WRITING FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS.

CONTRIBUTORS

HERBERT DINGLE
Emeritus Professor of History and Philosophy of Science, University of London; author of *Through Science to Philosophy* (1937), *Science and Literary Criticism* (1949), *The Scientific Adventure* (1952), etc.

ROBERTA FLORENCE BRINKLEY
Professor of English, Duke University, and Dean of The Woman's College; author of *Nathan Field, the Actor Playwright* (1928), *The Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century* (1932), and editor of *Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century* (1955), etc.

RONALD J. WILLIAMS
Professor of Near Eastern Studies, University College, University of Toronto

EDWARD A. BLOOM
Associate Professor of English, Brown University; author of *Samuel Johnson in Grub Street* (1957)

LILLIAN D. BLOOM
Assistant Professor of English, Rhode Island College of Education

JOHN LOUGH
Professor of French, University of Durham; author of *Locke's Travels in France* (1953), *An Introduction to Seventeenth Century France* (1954), and *Paris Theatre Audiences in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (1957)

TIME IN EXPERIENCE AND SCIENCE

Herbert Dingle

Time is so deeply rooted in consciousness itself that it is impossible for the normal human being to contemplate a state of existence apart from it. Mystics, indeed, speak of a timeless state, in which what we call past, present, and future are merged into a single eternal instant, but they are unable to convey their experience to others through the medium of words, and to most of us such a state must remain a mere theoretical possibility beyond imagination. For that very reason, however, time in its full sense becomes almost impossible to define. "What then is time?" asks St. Augustine, and he replies, "If no one asks me, I know; if I want to explain it to a questioner, I do not know." Neither do I. But what we can do is analyse the uses which we make of the word and so purge our statements about it from error and meaninglessness. To do this completely would be far too big a task for an article: our discussion here will be limited to the function of time in physical science. This will, of course, cover a considerable part of everyday life, but it will not touch problems arising in abnormal psychology or the possible phenomena of extra-sensory perception.

First of all we must notice that, although time is inseparable from ordinary consciousness, there is an important part of our normal mental activity to which it is irrelevant: the whole field of pure reason. Statements in logic and mathematics are independent of time. When I say that twice two will be four this time next year, I am not making a statement about time although "next year" appears in the sentence. Any other date could be substituted for it, or I could change the statement to "Twice two are four," and I should be saying exactly the same thing, for the relations between numbers are quite outside the scope of meaning of "time." If they are true they have been and will be true throughout eternity, whatever that may mean; at any rate, we immediately recognize that it is meaningless to say that they are true now but will become false later.

This introduces us to the fundamental division in scientific thought, namely, that between the empirical and the rational. It is as good a definition as any of this division to say that it separates what is independent of time from what is essentially temporal. When I say that the Earth rotates on its axis I am making a statement about experience (I may indeed express it differently by saying that the sky revolves about the Earth, but it is the same experience that I am thus expressing). Although practically I have no doubt that the Sun will rise as usual tomorrow, it is still a meaningful, and possibly a true, statement that the Earth will not rotate on its axis after midnight tonight. We can quite well imagine that such a change will occur, and describe some of its probable consequences, as H. G. Wells attempted to do in a well-known story, whereas we cannot imagine twice two as being anything but four at any time so long as words retain their present meanings. "The Sun will rise tomorrow" is an empirical, and so an essentially temporal, statement; "Twice two are four" is a rational, and so an essentially non-temporal, statement.

Science is presented with the empirical, the temporal, and endeavours to represent it in rational, non-temporal, terms. To do this it forms certain concepts (e.g., mass, electrical potential, natural selection) which it defines precisely and between which it establishes relations by rational deduction from the definitions. It then looks out on the world of experience and interprets the particular events which are given in observation in terms of its concepts. Thus, what we call a compass needle turning to the north on some particular occasion science describes as an exemplification of the timeless relation between magnetized bodies and a magnetic field. A magnetized body aligns itself with the field because of the definitions of magnetized bodies and magnetic fields. If for once it did not do so, the relation would not cease to be true: it would be concluded that the body concerned was not magnetized or the field was not magnetic. In this way we construct a timeless system of scientific laws which express the relations between occurrences which are essentially temporal. The great anomaly is that we cannot succeed without making time itself one of the concepts. It must be conceived in non-temporal terms and yet identified with time itself.

So essential is the concept of time to the structure of science that it is doubtful if a scientific law is possible from which it is excluded. Pure geometry is independent of time, and it was once thought that the objects in the universe necessarily exhibit the relations found in Euclidean geometry. If that were so, then there would be a system of physical laws

independent of the time concept. But we now realize that Euclidean geometry, though certainly non-temporal, is a rational system only. Its definitions, postulates, and axioms, from which all the theorems follow by rational necessity, have their origin in our minds alone, and the universe of experience has no *necessary* relation to them. Not only so, but since the parts of the universe are in relative motion, and we can know of the distant parts only through something else—light—which moves, we cannot establish a relation by identifying a Euclidean straight line, for example, with the line joining two natural objects without ensuring that the objects are considered at the same instant, and that inevitably brings in the concept of time.

Again, we try to rid our laws of their temporal dependence by eliminating all explicit reference to time. In this we often succeed, and are more satisfied with such a law as Newton's law of gravitation, for example, which is expressed only in terms of mass, force, and distance, than with Galileo's law of falling bodies, which relates the distance covered to the time of fall. But the transcendence of time here is only in appearance. When we analyse the concepts we find that "force" is merely a name for temporal rate of change of motion, and "motion" merely a name for temporal rate of change of position. The universal law of gravitation is no more independent of the time concept than the terrestrial law of fall. It is more general in relation to space and matter, but it is equally dependent on the concept of time.

We are led, then, to the recognition of a fundamental distinction between the *concept* of time and the *experience* of time. The former, like all concepts, is under our control: we define it as we please, but always, of course, with a view to its use in describing and correlating experience. The experience of time, on the other hand, is quite outside our control. It is not our contrivance that this experience succeeds that and does not precede it, but it is our contrivance that the succession occurs regularly and not irregularly, because the order of occurrence of experiences is given to us unalterably, but the measure of the intervals between experiences is a function of the concept of time which we may choose to adopt. The time of experience has no measure: what is an age to the bored is a moment to the entranced. The measure of time is essentially rational, conceptual. Let us see how we apply it to our purposes.

The normal procedure in establishing a measure system is to choose a sample of the thing to be measured, which we call a *unit*, and then to define a process for ascertaining how many of such units are equivalent to the quantity we wish to measure. For example, in order to measure

distances we choose a unit rod—the standard metre, which is preserved in Paris—and then prescribe a procedure for making copies of this unit which we can use in order to find the length of any given object. The details of the process are complicated, but involve no difficulty of comprehension. In the same way we measure mass by choosing a standard kilogram—also preserved in Paris—and prescribe a procedure for comparing it with a body whose mass is required. But it is at once obvious that we cannot do this with time. It is impossible to choose a standard second and preserve it because it is of the essence of the time concept that it cannot be preserved: you can't *keep* time. Some radically different method must be adopted if we are to obtain anything that we can call a *measure* of time.

Before proceeding to describe such a method, it is well for us to realize our essential freedom in choosing a process of measurement of anything at all. The standard metre is, in fact, made of an alloy of platinum and iridium and kept at a constant temperature, not because such a rod is in any fundamental sense *constant* in length, but because it preserves a sort of ideal of constancy to which a large number of other terrestrial objects approximate. If we chose a young snake, for example, as our standard unit, we should find that with the passage of time most objects that we normally call rigid would be shrinking (because the snake, as we now say, would be growing). This would be highly inconvenient, but that would be the only objection to it. Whatever choice we make, we cannot avoid having to say that some objects grow and others shrink, but we wish to reduce these to the minimum, and so we choose as a standard a body that behaves as "normally" as possible. Our streets and houses then keep the same size, while snakes, children, and trees grow, and pencils and lipsticks shrink.

But this is not because the Paris metre is, from the point of view of nature, constant while the snake is inconstant: it is entirely a matter of convenience. To see this, let us take a larger view and consider the universe as a whole—or as much of it as we can survey with our telescopes. We see an assembly of nebulae—each a swarm of stars separated from the others by empty spaces, the whole showing an approximately uniform distribution in space, like flies in a swarm. But instead of moving haphazardly like the flies, the whole swarm of nebulae appears to be opening out, the distance between each nebula and its neighbours getting steadily and uniformly greater when (effectively) measured by our standard metre. Now a being built on the cosmic scale and pattern, and accustomed to moving from one nebula to another, would find it con-

venient to suppose that the distances between the nebulae were constant. He would have to suppose, of course, that the Earth, with its "rigid" contents, was slowly shrinking, but this would appear to him to be quite natural. There are millions of nebulae, and it would be far simpler to take their separations from one another as a standard of constancy, and the Earth as slowly shrinking, than to judge the universe by the standard of an insignificant little planet. His unit of measurement would be the distance from one nebula to another, which we would say was a constantly growing unit, and although it does not grow so fast as a snake, it will serve to assure us that it is not natural necessity, but simply convenience, that leads us to choose the Paris metre as a standard of length. Similar considerations apply to other measurable quantities.

When we come to measure time, therefore, we must allow for a certain amount of freedom in making our choice. And, indeed, in this case it is almost forced on us. We have seen that to compare two intervals of time we cannot bring them together as we can two intervals of space, because we cannot keep one until the other arrives. To obtain a practical standard of time measurement, therefore, there is nothing to do but to choose some natural process that goes on repeating itself, and say voluntarily that we will *define* the successive repetitions as enduring for equal times. There is then no meaning in asking if they *really* endure for equal times. We are forming a *concept* of time, and that is a process that is entirely voluntary, the only stipulation being that it shall serve our purpose of enabling us conveniently to form laws which shall represent experience. The *experience* of time—which is what we have in mind when we expect some absolute equality of time intervals—is not susceptible of measurement at all. Our concept of time enables us to foretell events and to know at what reading of our clock they will occur, and that is all we can possibly ask of it.

What recurring process shall we choose? The idea that there is some natural equality of successive time durations is fostered by the fact that, just as there are many rigid bodies which, if equal in size at one time, remain practically equal in size thereafter, so there are many recurring processes which exhibit a similar regularity of occurrence. Thus the beating of our hearts, the swing of a pendulum, the movements of the heavenly bodies, and so on, are such that, if any one of them is chosen as defining a uniform scale of time measurement, the others do so as well. This particular uniformity, in fact, has so impressed itself on our imaginations that we tend to think of it as the only possible one. We compare the interval between two successive pulse beats with what we

remember of the previous interval, and think that there is a kind of objective equality between them that we must perforce accept, whether it is convenient to do so or otherwise. This, however, is not so.

We see this best when we make our measurements more precise, and then we find that these apparently identical scales of time measurement do, in fact, disagree to a very slight extent. For everyday life the difference is negligible, but for scientific purposes it is fundamentally important. For instance, confining ourselves to the heavenly bodies for simplicity, we find that if we suppose that the time of rotation of the Earth on its axis (the day) is constant, the time of revolution of the Earth round the Sun (the year) is not constant. The irregularity is slight but unmistakable. Assuming the mechanical laws of motion, we can calculate the dates and places of appearance of ancient eclipses of the Sun from our present observations of the heavenly bodies, and compare them with historical records. We then find that they occurred at places slightly removed from the calculated ones, because the Earth's rate of rotation has changed slightly: it is steadily slowing down. The change is only about a thousandth of a second in each century, but that is a large quantity for the astronomer. It means that if the year is constant the day is lengthening, and if the day is constant the year is shortening. We can take our choice of which form of expression we adopt.

This is but one of the complications we meet with when we strive after precision in time measurement. The whole problem is now engaging the attention of the International Astronomical Union. Until quite recently the fundamental unit of time—that which we call the *second* in the C.G.S. system of units—has been based on the assumption of the constancy of the Earth's period of rotation. The second is the 1/86,400th part of the mean solar day, and the mean solar day is the average time throughout the year between successive passages of the Sun across the meridian of a place fixed on the Earth's surface. (The *actual* time between successive passages varies throughout the year when measured against the time between successive passages of a distant star after correction for certain anomalies.) As we interpret these transits of the Sun as an effect of the rotation of the Earth on its axis, the adoption of the above defined second is equivalent to the assumption that the Earth's rotation is uniform.

This assumption has now ceased to be convenient. In 1952 the International Astronomical Union recommended that we should cease to take the day as our standard of constancy, and substitute the year. And to avoid difficulties arising from the variability of the year when its

length is estimated by observation of the stars, a *particular* year—namely, 1900 A.D.—was chosen as the fundamental unit of time. As this is too long a unit for convenience in many problems, a new second was defined as 1/31,556,925.9747 of the year 1900. Time reckoned in the new units is to be called *Ephemeris Time*.

How is it possible to measure time now by a standard which has already gone? What in fact is done is this. We have records of the position of the Sun among the stars (the longitude of the sun) throughout the year 1900. We give the name "second" now to an interval of time during which the longitude of the Sun changes by the same amount as it did in one second in the year 1900. That, in effect, of course, assumes that the stars are fixed. We know that they are not: that is to say, we know that they move relatively to each other, so that if one is fixed the others cannot be. They are so far away, however, that these movements are exceedingly small in appearance, and we average them out so that the mean position of the stars we observe is effectively taken as fixed. Beyond this we cannot go. Nature provides no absolute standard of rest. Here again we must make our choice of a standard, and we do it in the way described because that is, in the last resort, the most convenient, i.e. it provides us with a time scale that enables us to describe the processes of nature in the simplest and most comprehensive way.

This, however, is by no means the whole of the matter. We cannot attach a fully equipped observatory to every laboratory, let alone to every household, in order to determine the time. We must have clocks, i.e., artificial mechanisms which record time according to the standard we adopt. The astronomical standard of time has until now always been the fundamental one because the movements of the heavenly bodies, besides approximating closely to the ideal standard of constancy of so many phenomena which has already been mentioned, persist over such long periods of time without attention that we have no fear of upsetting our chronological record through forgetting to wind them up. These advantages have been so great that the problem of clock-making has been that of producing artificial instruments that will record astronomical time. The progress of physics, however, has now brought us to a point at which laboratory standards can seriously compete with heavenly ones as *fundamental* standards—not, indeed, for continuous records over long periods of time, but rather for comparison of equality of short neighbouring intervals.

A quartz crystal, when set oscillating electrically, vibrates with a frequency which, when compared with astronomical observation of the

rotation of the Earth, seems to fluctuate irregularly. Other quartz crystals, however, show the same fluctuations, so that it is much simpler to suppose that the crystals vibrate uniformly and that the Earth's rotation is irregular. These fluctuations occur throughout the course of a single day: they are not found merely by comparing the length of one day with that of another. If we suppose that the Earth does rotate irregularly, we are led to seek a physical cause for the phenomenon, and some suggestions have been made, but that is a problem for the future. From our present point of view the important thing is that, for comparing short neighbouring intervals of time, we have found a more convenient standard than that of the rotating Earth.

We cannot, however, adopt a vibrating crystal for long continuous records. Different crystals behave differently over extended periods, and the same one, if stopped and started again, does not vibrate as before. But there is another physical standard which we believe does provide a frequency of vibration which may be regarded as constant over indefinitely long periods of time and of which we have innumerable identical samples: it is a radiating atom of some particular element. What we call the frequency of vibration of an atom is made evident to us by the frequency of the radiation which it emits, and we can establish physical conditions of such constancy that the atom of a given substance can be made to emit radiations with all the qualifications for a fundamental standard of frequency. For practical reasons the atom of caesium is the most convenient, and a prescription can be laid down by means of which its radiation can be applied to frequency measurement, i.e., can become a clock. Such a clock must be considered a rival to the clock of the heavens as a standard for short-term measurements of time.

What will decide which standard shall ultimately prevail? As we have seen, the final arbiter must be the laws of nature: that standard is best which enables the course of natural phenomena to be described in the simplest terms. Now such a standard, of course, may not be provided by any natural phenomenon: all actually occurring periodicities may be merely approximations to it. In that case we shall use them for practical purposes, and apply corrections to bring their indications to the ideal. This process began nearly three hundred years ago. The first *theoretical* standard of time measurement was provided by Newton's first law of motion, which says that a body unacted upon by any forces will, if moving, move *uniformly*, i.e. it will cover equal distances in equal times. That means that equal times are those in which such a body covers equal distances, and this body, together with a standard space-measuring scale, therefore constitutes an ideal theoretical clock. It is the time scale given

by such a clock that is assumed whenever we apply the Newtonian laws to a mechanical problem: in particular, it is by comparison with this time scale that we regard the rotation of the Earth as gradually slowing down in the way described above. Relativity mechanics has made no essential difference to this. Instead of a body under no forces we prescribe a beam of light *in vacuo*, but the resulting time scale is the same.

The path of our progress towards a satisfactory concept of time measurement can now be described in summary form. We begin with an instinctive idea of equal time intervals, perhaps originating in the rhythm of our heartbeats, but at any rate universally recognized, so that, for instance, an orchestra has no difficulty in anticipating the succession of beats of the conductor's baton. We construct clocks that reproduce this rhythm, checking them by comparison with the movements of the heavenly bodies which also exhibit it. In terms of these clocks we find that when we, as far as possible, remove all forces from a body—by rolling a smooth ball over a surface of ice, for example—the body tends to move over equal distances in equal times; and the closer we approximate to the ideal conditions, the more nearly do we approach this state of movement. We therefore imagine an ideal clock which would show equal times for the motion of the body (or of a beam of light) if it could be freed from all forces of every kind, i.e. if it were in an otherwise empty universe. This clock then provides our fundamental time scale. We cannot realize it in practice, but we can calculate, from the laws of mechanics based on it, how the behaviour of bodies can be described in terms of it, and we then look round to see what actual bodies come closest to this behaviour, and adopt them as our practical time standards. At present we have two with comparable claims: the revolution of the Earth around the Sun, seen against the background of a universe of stars; and radiations from a specified kind of atom under controlled conditions. That is our present state in this matter.

Let us now recall the relation between this *concept* of time and our *experience* of time. We know by experience that events happen in a certain order: we remember some that are past, and know immediately that they happened before those which we say are occurring now. Our concept of time takes account of this by ascribing to the former smaller measure numbers than those ascribed to the latter. Whenever we have an experience of any kind at all—in particular, when we make an observation in physics—we can in principle look at our clock and note the time (experiences occurring in sleep belong to the province of psychology and are outside our present consideration). There is thus a complete correspondence between experience and concept with regard to the *order*

of things. But the concept adds to this a measure of the *interval between* experiences. That is only very roughly represented in direct experience; that is why we have such latitude in choosing a measure scale. Scientific concepts must conform to experience and must be amenable to reason, but they are subject to no other control. We use the liberty that this fact affords us in order to give them the best possible form for our purpose of representing the whole of experience by a rationally organized system.

The next step towards this end is an extremely important one. All our experience is of events here: we have no experience of events at a distance. If an explosion occurs on a star in the Milky Way we do not know of it: what we know is the appearance, here and now, of a "nova." When we have that experience we can look at our clock (or calendar, which for this purpose is part of the same thing) and time it, but that is the time of the experience, not of the explosion. There is nothing whatever in the experience of seeing the nova that will by itself justify us or guide us in assigning a time to the explosion. If we wish to do that we must amplify our *concept* of time, which we have perfect liberty to do so long as we do not violate experience. We do, in fact, find it necessary to give times to distant events. Let us see how it is done.

Various phenomena have made it necessary for us to ascribe our experience to events occurring in space, of which we become aware by means of an agency which we call "light" which travels from the events to our eyes. Further phenomena have led us to suppose that light travels with a constant velocity, c, and this means that if, at a time t, we observe an event at a distance x from us, the time which we must assign to the event is $t - x/c$. The larger x is, therefore, the earlier is the event, and so the aspect which very distant bodies present to us is that which we must suppose they wore in the distant past. But this has nothing to do with our experience: it is merely the result of extending our concept of time beyond its immediate purpose of corresponding with our experience of time, which is always here.

Furthermore, we can see that this extension does not give us, for a distant event, a unique time which is the same for all beholders of it. Suppose we wish to time an event on a dark planet. We do so in principle by sending a beam of light from the earth to the planet, so that it arrives when the event is occurring and then returns to us showing the occurrence. If the light left us at time t_1 by our clock and returned at time t_3, then the time of its arrival will be half-way between these times, namely, $t_2 = \frac{1}{2}(t_1 + t_3)$, and this is therefore the time that we shall assign to the event. But now suppose a space-traveller leaves us at the same time as the light, and travels towards the planet at a smaller, but still con-

siderable, speed. He notes that the light left at t_1, but he will receive it back at an earlier time than t_3 ($t_3 - 2\epsilon$, say) because he is travelling to meet it. He will therefore ascribe the event to a time $\frac{1}{2}(t_1 + t_3 - 2\epsilon) = t_2 - \epsilon$. We are at first inclined to say that he should make allowance for his motion and so "correct" his value, but he may retort that it was not he who was moving towards the planet but we who were moving away from it: his time for the event, he would say, is therefore correct, and ours puts it too late. We can hardly reply that the planet is at rest with respect to us and not with respect to him, because in fact that may not be true and also because the motion of the planet has nothing to do with the matter. The event in question is an instantaneous one, and wherever the planet may have been before and after the arrival of the light (i.e., however the planet may have been moving), its position at the moment of arrival of the light is the only thing that is in question. The sole point of importance, therefore, is which of the two observers, the Earth-observer or the space-traveller, is the "moving" one.

Up to now, we have to confess that we have no means of answering this question. Every experiment that we have been able to devise, that can possibly be performed, gives the same result no matter which of two relatively moving bodies is supposed to be actually the moving one. Every experiment that would give different results in the two cases turns out to be impossible—not merely because of practical difficulties but impossible in principle. If, for instance, we could put a clock on the planet to time the arrival of the light, we could answer our question, but to do that we should have to make sure that the clock was set correctly, i.e. that it was synchronized with the Earth clock that timed the emission of the light, and we could not do that without knowing just what we are trying to find out. We have therefore come to the conclusion that if two bodies are in relative motion, it is meaningless to ask which is moving: the situation is completely expressed by saying that one is moving at such and such a velocity with respect to the other. To ask to which of them the motion belongs would be equivalent to asking of two brothers which is actually the brother and which the one of whom he is the brother. In other words, motion, by its very nature, is a relative phenomenon: if the universe consisted only of a single particle the idea of motion would have no meaning at all.

It follows from this that there is no *unique* meaning in saying that two events in different places happened at the same time. Within a limited range it is possible to say, of two such events, that one occurred either before or after the other, according to the motions involved. Strictly speaking, this is true however small the distance between the events, but

for any terrestrial distance the various alternatives are so close together as to be utterly indistinguishable by any practicable means. Thus, although the event in New Zealand which is simultaneous with, say, the death of a man in London depends on whether the man dies in a hospital or in a moving train, the difference is only a few thousand millionths of a second. The events on the nearest of the extra-galactic nebulae which would be simultaneous with this event in London, however, would be about a month apart in the two cases. It is this extreme smallness in the range of indefiniteness in timing distant events that has allowed us until quite recently to suppose that they have absolute times, and even now it is difficult for many, unaccustomed to the idea, to realize that a particular event at a distance may be before or after the present moment, and that it is impossible to decide in an absolute sense between the alternatives.

The difficulty comes from the failure to distinguish between the *experience* of time and the *concept* of time. Our experience comes to us as a succession of events which occur in a certain order. We cannot change that order: we can remember a past experience but not a future one, and that compels us to distinguish in a unique way between the two. But we do not experience distant events. Our knowledge of them comes inevitably after they have occurred, and its order is not necessarily that in which we find it necessary to say that they did occur. We are familiar enough with this fact: we know, for instance, that we may receive a letter today which we believe was written earlier than one which we received yesterday. If the letters bear no date, indicate no place of origin, and contain no internal evidence bearing on the matter, we keep an open mind about the order in which they were written and decide it, if at all, by some process of deduction which we believe to be valid. That is the position in which we are with regard to distant astronomical events. Our process of deduction here must include a reference to the properties of light because it is through the light from the events that we become aware of them. Light takes time to travel, and it should not be difficult to understand that two persons in relative motion may reach different conclusions when applying the same process in order to deduce the time of an event from the times of their observation of it. The "time" which we assign to a distant event must necessarily be entirely a *conceptual* time—something resulting from the application of a rational procedure which we choose. The time which we assign to an experience, on the other hand, is determined for us, so far as its relation of before-and-after to other experiences is concerned. No modification of conceptual time can alter that fact in the slightest degree.

MILTON IN FRENCH LITERATURE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Florence Brinkley

When the French writers broke away from classicism, their search for fresh materials and new heroes led them to real characters in history and literature, whether their own or those of other countries. Most of the Continental countries furnished sources, but England was most frequently drawn upon because of her great popularity in France at this time. J. G. Robertson says that "the French literature of the first twenty or thirty years of the nineteenth century represents the most intense period of Miltonic influence on any alien literature."[1] One phase of the expression of this interest is the introduction of Milton as a character into various literary works. Since the Revolution had brought the French to a better understanding of the Civil War, it is not surprising to find Charles I, Cromwell, and Charles II freely introduced into their literature. Historical characters from other periods, as well as poets and playwrights, also often appear. Under the influence of Madame de Staël, England was considered the particular home of genius, and Shakespeare and Milton, Chatterton and Thomson, are among the poets used fictionally by French writers.

Loving the dramatic, the French writers seize upon episodes which lend themselves to dialogue and action, whatever the literary *genre* chosen as a medium. They use situations which have been associated with a real person, regardless of whether these are biographical or only legendary, and they often add material to make a good story. They pay little attention to accurate chronology or characterization and sometimes even give a different name to a character. An amusing instance of change of fact occurs in a play *Thompson et Garrick, ou L'Auteur et l'acteur*, 1822, written by Messrs. J. A. Jacquelin and Ourry. In the last scene the dramatists tell of the generosity of an actor to Thomson, an incident for

which they give a reference to Laplace "dans son 6e volume des *pièces intéressantes et peu connues*." The actor is Quin according to Laplace's story, but the dramatists say that Quin is a name which "serait désagréable pour les oreilles Françaises" and therefore they attribute the incident to Garrick.

Several legendary stories of Milton's life provided material for effective scenes. One of the most popular of these was that Milton had saved the life of Davenant, poet and ardent Royalist, when Cromwell was in power and that in turn Davenant secured the king's pardon for Milton after the Restoration.[2] With variations in detail this story occurs in two poems, an opera, a novel, and a play. Since Milton's brother Christopher was in the Royalist service after the fall of Reading, it seemed plausible that Milton should use his influence with Cromwell to save him as well as Davenant, and this situation is introduced into a poem and a novel. Milton's pleading with Cromwell not to assume the crown is referred to in a poem and a novel and becomes one of the finest scenes in Victor Hugo's play *Cromwell*.

Such biographical materials as the Italian journey and the meeting with Galileo, Milton's position as Cromwell's secretary, and his loss of sight while in office provide additional material and sometimes form a point of departure for fictional elaboration. Since Milton was in Paris on his Grand Tour, two writers imagine that he met Corneille and discussed poetry with him. He is also represented attending a play in Italy which depicted the fall of man.[3] Through this performance, it is said, he became aware of the grandeur of the subject. Though Milton cut off all his daughters in his will, calling them "unkind children" who had been "undutiful" to him, the tradition is that the youngest one, Deborah, had real affection for him. So it is Deborah, who was only eight years old at the time of the Restoration, to whom one writer gives a rôle of devoted care for her father in his blindness which is compared with that of Antigone for Oedipus. Other writers are less accurate as to the daughter's name (one calls her Emma!), but they, too, represent her as an Antigone. Milton's Antigone, however, has the additional responsibility of writing down her father's lines whenever he speaks in inspired tones. Whether Milton is treated as the learned young poet travelling in foreign countries, the vigorous follower of Cromwell with biting words for the enemy, or a blind and feeble old man, the foundation of fact is scarcely discernible in the French portrayals.

Chateaubriand, whose appreciative estimate of Milton's work did much to establish its great popularity in France, led the way in introducing Milton as a speaking character into French literature. In his poem

"Milton et Davenant" (1797), he presents the Davenant legend primarily in dialogue form.

In the opening scene, soldiers bring a captured Royalist to Milton, who in his pamphleteer style addresses him as "Vassal with the double heart of a slave and a traitor" and demands his name. When the Royalist replies, "My name is Davenant," Milton is faced with a dilemma, for poetry and politics are in conflict. For the sake of poetry, which "never dies," he spares Davenant's life, saying,

> What! will the law strike with its angry sword
> A son of Apollo? . . . No, no, posterity!

Chateaubriand does considerable violence to Milton's character in this scene, for he has Milton first lie to the soldiers and then bribe them. He says that Davenant is "un grand républicain" and adds,

> I know on good authority
> That he has greatly rejoiced at the death of the Stuart.

Davenant cries, "No!" but Milton covers his mouth with one hand, pushes him back into the room, locks the door, and then gives the soldiers a little gold as he "politely" sends them away. When he rejoins Davenant, the two poets, "charmed with their diverse talents," recite selections from their poems. Milton repeats "the spritely *Allegro*," the "sweet *Penseroso*," and the choruses from *Samson Agonistes*. These choices give some indication of what poems of Milton's were popular in the late eighteenth century. The fact that the choruses of *Samson Agonistes* were included presumably before the play was written leads one to ask whether this is an anachronism on Chateaubriand's part, or whether it supports the theory presented by several scholars that *Samson Agonistes* was largely composed much before the time of publication.

The next episode in the poem shows Milton in hiding after the Restoration. His daughter, who reads "the old Homer to the Homer Christian," cares for her father as tenderly as Antigone for Oedipus. At midnight a number of soldiers come to the door; the leader, with face concealed, enters and delivers what he says is "the fatal order." The daughter attempts to read it through her tears, but her tears cease when she sees that King Charles has given Davenant, "as a reward for his fidelity, the pardon of Milton."

In the one-act opera by D'Etienne Jouy and Dieulafoy, *Milton fait historique* (1803), it is Davenant's son who secures Milton's pardon, and so discharges a "sacred debt" bequeathed to him by his father. Here chronology is disregarded, for if the basic Milton-Davenant legend is accepted, Davenant saved Milton in 1660 and did not die until 1668.

The story of the opera offers a number of good dramatic situations, however, and these are exploited to the full.

Milton is in hiding at the home of Godwin, an English Quaker Justice of the Peace, and his niece Charlotte. The poet is cared for by a daughter who is given the name of Emma and is again compared with Antigone. While Godwin is away trying to secure Milton's pardon, Charlotte engages Arthur, a young man with whom she is in love, as Emma's tutor. To meet Milton's specification of age, Arthur (who proves to be Davenant's son) poses as a man of sixty. This pose increases suspense, for Milton is often on the verge of discovering Arthur's youth.

Upon his return from his unsuccessful mission, Godwin apparently recognizes Davenant and thinks he is there to betray Milton. Very dramatically he tells Arthur what he had planned to say concerning Davenant's obligation to Milton. Complications arise when Milton plans to flee to the mountains, leaving Emma in her tutor's care, and when Charlotte discovers that Arthur and Emma are in love. All is resolved, however, when a messenger brings Davenant the king's pardon for Milton; Davenant explains his duplicity as a means for more surely fulfilling his bequest; and Charlotte resigns herself to the idea that she is too old for Arthur.

As its type *opéra comique* designates, the opera stresses dramatic action more than music; but various songs are introduced, and Milton is given a singing rôle. According to Aubrey, Milton had a "delicate, tunable voice," and therefore such a rôle does not seem inappropriate; but his first and last parts are out of character for an old blind poet. First, when Emma and Arthur sing a Scottish love song, Milton takes up the refrain with them; and in the song which concludes the opera, he begins with an invocation to Hymen to "come bless this happy day of my dear daughter." Then, after brief duets by Emma and Arthur and by Charlotte and Godwin, he joins these four characters in singing the two last lines:

> Hymen, come to unite on this day
> Friendship, glory, and love.

Milton's solos are more appropriate, for they are taken from his own work. In scene 10 he sings the "Hymne à la Lumière"[4] based on the invocation to light in *Paradise Lost*, III, 40 ff., and the lines on the deprivations of blindness. The song is, however, written in iambic tetrameter with alternating rhymes. In scene 19 he sings an arrangement of *Paradise Lost*, IV, 264 ff., describing Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. In this scene he enters from a garden where he has found inspira-

tion for the "description of the loves of Adam and Eve." He says, "Take the harp, my daughter, and accompany the rapture which animates my senses." It is Arthur this time who undertakes to write down Milton's words, but as he and Emma recognize the analogy of the purity of their love to that of Adam and Eve, both leave their tasks and moving towards each other embrace as they sing with Milton the final lines.

The music for the opera was written by a composer of distinction, Gaspare Spontini, and Milton's rôle was composed especially for Solié, who had a baritone voice, a rarity in France. After Solié's death the performances were discontinued because of the difficulty of finding another baritone who could "act and sing with equal perfection."

The opera was published in 1805 with the Milton-Davenant story substantiated by the citation of a number of sources, including Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, William Hayley's *Life of Milton*, and Pope's *Familiar Letters*. It proved to be quite popular and in 1805 was produced in French in Brussels, in German in Vienna, and in Spanish in Madrid. It was given in German in 1806 in Berlin. It has been revived several times: in Aachen in 1829, in Weimar in 1834, and in Vienna in 1839.[5]

Milton's gaining a pardon for Davenant from Cromwell furnishes an episode in Victor Hugo's enormous verse drama *Cromwell*.[6] In Act V, scene 13, when various condemned Cavaliers have been pardoned, Cromwell turns to his secretary and says, "Have you nothing to ask me?" He promises to grant Milton's request, but when Milton asks for Davenant's pardon, he demurs. He has, however, given his word and is obliged to free Davenant. He discloses that he plans to make Milton poet laureate, but Milton rejects the idea, saying that Davenant fills the post.

Both the Davenant and the Christopher Milton stories appear in three other works within the space of nine years. Julien Paillet de Plombières' poem *Milton mourant* ("Discours en vers prononcé en séance publique de l'Athénée des Arts, le 5 août, 1833") is primarily a monologue in which Milton recalls to his assembled family the chief events of his life. He speaks particularly of how Davenant has been his protector and of how earlier he had been able to save the lives of both Davenant and Christopher.

The novel *Milton* by H. Riquier-Aldée (1839) expands the Christopher story. Christopher was involved in a Royalist plot to deliver the king on the night before his death. The plot is revealed, and Milton allows himself to be arrested in Christopher's place. Cromwell, who had seen some of Milton's writings, pardons his "fraternal action." Then

Milton discovers Davenant languishing in the Tower and also secures his release. The Christopher story does not end with Milton's magnanimous action. During a conversation in which Milton and his mother beg Christopher to give up politics, Christopher mentions an "infamous book," the *Defense of the English People*. When Milton says he wrote it, Christopher renounces his brother and the whole family, waves his sword in Milton's face, and goes to France. His mother reacts physically to this violent scene and soon thereafter dies, a situation very different from fact, for his mother had died in 1637, some fourteen years before the *Defense* was written.

A play by Joseph de Dulcat, *Milton ou La Gloire du repentir* (1842), is the most vivid of all the portrayals of Milton's being saved by the king's pardon. It is written without regard to fact but with considerable dramatic effectiveness. The letter of pardon has been secured jointly by Davenant and the king's physician Dr. Harvey, but of the two it is only Harvey who appears in the play. His rôle is an important one: he plots with General Monck for the restoration of Charles II; he receives the report of Cromwell's death and of Richard Cromwell's renunciation of the crown; and he informs Charles II that Parliament has proclaimed the Restoration. It is to him that Milton goes "pressé par sa conscience" to confess that he was mistaken in thinking that good would come from a revolution and that he now repents the part he has played. It is Harvey who intervenes when the throng celebrating the Restoration becomes an angry mob and seizes Milton, shouting "à mort! à la Tamise! à bas le régicide! tuez l'infame!" And finally Harvey shelters Milton and his daughter in his own residence.

The play, as its sub-title indicates, makes much of the doctrine of repentance. Harvey in the confession scene tells Milton that when one recognizes his faults and repents, God pardons him. Milton continues in a state of despair and, in speaking to his daughter, questions what hope is possible since his "hand is soiled with the apology of regicide" and he is deprived of sight. Here he repeats some lines on his blindness, from the passage in Book III of *Paradise Lost*, as his daughter writes down his inspired words. Then she undertakes to convince him of the efficacy of repentance, and he has just decided in the words of Adam (Book X, 1087–92) to make his confession to God with sighs and tears and a humble spirit when the mob interrupts. After his own experience of despair, repentance, and ultimate pardon, Milton turns with deeper understanding to writing *Paradise Lost* as a monument to the glory of God.

Milton's rôle in advising Cromwell against becoming king is recalled in *Milton mourant* and is dismissed in Riquier-Aldée's novel with, "Cromwell promuit à Milton de ne pas être roi; mais, le lendemain, il régnait comme Protecteur." Hugo, however, makes it the most eloquent and effective scene in his play, and in writing in the character of Milton achieves an added dignity and force of expression which Cromwell terms a "wondrous style." In one place he employs rather effectively Milton's stylistic device of a catalogue of names:

> and **Sydney,**
> Hollis, Martyn, Bradshaw, the mighty men,
> Who read his death-warrant to Charles the First,
> And Hampden, young descended to the tomb,—
> All worked for Cromwell and all are now forgot.

In Act V, scene 8, Milton is led by his guide into the throne room and stands in despair, turned towards the throne. His twenty-line soliloquy is in reality a farewell to Cromwell and sobers even Cromwell's Four Fools, who are at one side of the stage. When the crowd enters, Milton "retires into a corner"; but he cannot be forgotten, for more than once he speaks out in a loud voice. As Cromwell reaches the foot of the throne Milton cries out "Cromwell, beware! . . . Beware the Ides of March," the words used by the Soothsayer to Caesar.

Two scenes of the play (Act III, scenes 2 and 3) show Milton in Cromwell's Council in his position as secretary. Although in 1657, the time represented in the play, Milton was only forty-nine years old, he is described as having "white hair, rather long." Davenant speaks of him as "an old doctor of law," but when Cromwell also refers to him as "old Milton," he replies testily:

> Old Milton! I beg you—
> I am nine years less old than you, my lord.

Milton, long known in France chiefly as a prose writer, is represented as being regarded even by his own countrymen primarily as a political controversialist. Rochester speaks of him as the author of "The *Iconoclast* and other senseless things" and as the "Obscure antagonist of great Saumaise." Cromwell, on the other hand, admires the *Iconoclast*, but not Milton's "great devil." Even Davenant regards him as "Good clerk enough/But a distressing poet." It is Rochester who points out that Milton is behind the times in his poetry and lacking in "taste"; he should study the French writers:

You do not comprehend true poetry.
You have some wit, but scarcely any taste.
The French excel us in everything.
Go study Racan. Read his pastorals.
Let Tircis with Aminta haunt your fields
Leading a gentle lamb with a blue ribbon.
But for your Eve, your Adam, and your hell,
Your lake of fire,—all that is hideous.

In his historical novel *Cinq-Mars* (1826), De Vigny portrays the popular salon of Marion de Lorme, where distinguished literary figures met and malcontents gathered to conspire against Richelieu. Since the French salons were frequented by many English visitors who sought their creative stimulus, the free give and take of criticism, and an opportunity to exchange ideas with learned men of other nations, Milton would have been a likely guest. Especially in view of Milton's popularity in the academies of Florence and Rome just prior to the historical time of the novel, De Vigny creates a plausible situation in presenting him at an evening of reading at Mlle de Lorme's, in company with Scudéry, Descartes, Molière, and Corneille.

When it was time for the evening's reading to begin, Mlle de Lorme would not allow Desbarreaux, her favoured admirer, to be the first, for she expected interruptions from the arrival of other guests. She says, "It would be actual murder to allow a great mind to speak during this noise and confusion," and so instead she presents Milton to read some of his verses! He is quite prepared to read; and for the benefit of those who do not understand English, he "has had the passages he is going to read translated by an ex-secretary of the Duke of Buckingham." Marion de Lorme herself distributes the copies, and after some persuasion Milton is drawn away from his conversation with Corneille.

The portrayal of the poet is not that of the vigorous young swordsman who made the Grand Tour; it is more like the painting by Munkácsy of the blind "Milton dictating to his daughters":

> He at last advanced to an armchair placed near the table; he seemed of feeble health, and fell into, rather than seated himself in, the chair. He rested his elbow on the table, and with his hand covered his large and beautiful eyes, which were half closed, and reddened with night-watches or tears.

He recites in English, though it seems quite out of character for him not to address a foreign audience in their own tongue. At the time of the Grand Tour, Milton in reality was still contemplating the Arthurian story for his great work (as we learn from his poems "Mansus" and the "Epitaphium Damonis," both of which were written after his return

to England); but he is represented as having already composed the greater part of *Paradise Lost*. He is supposed to give "fragments" of his poem, but De Vigny's summary of what he recited covers a large part of a number of the books. Milton begins with the invocation, describes the scene in Hell, and gives Satan's address to Beelzebub. This was not too well received; and when there was the interruption of another arrival, Corneille "whispered": "I would advise you to change the picture; your hearers are not on a level with this."

Milton follows this advice and resumes with the description of Adam and Eve in Paradise. Mlle de Lorme is greatly moved by the scene: "The idea of virtuous love appeared to her for the first time in all its beauty; and she seemed as if struck with a magic wand, and changed into a pale and beautiful statue."

Desbarreaux reacts very differently, and it is through him and some of his vocal friends that De Vigny expresses the contrast in style between the French writers of his day and the pre-Restoration English writers. Desbarreaux cries out, "I can't stand this! It is of an insipidity to make one sick!" Scudéry joins in and laments the "absence of grace, gallantry, and the *belle flamme*!" A third groans, "Where is the *Ariane*, where the *Astrea*?"

Milton tries another part of his poem, that of Raphael's visit to the Garden, the narrative of the battle in Heaven, and the fall of the revolting angels. This, however, is too much for the salon group, "for religious scruples became leagued with false taste." The company rises, and dancing is substituted for reading. Milton, Corneille, Racine, and De Thou find a quiet room where they talk together for the next two hours. Of this conversation we are told only that Corneille warned Milton, "If you aim at present glory, do not expect it from so fine a work," and that Milton replied much in the manner of the *Lycidas* passage on fame, "What matters to me the glory of the moment?"

After that evening, Milton does not reappear in the novel until near the end. He has remained in Paris during the entire time of the plot against Richelieu, though strangely enough this fact was not known even by Corneille. He becomes a convenient device by which De Vigny informs the reader of the execution of De Thou and Cinq-Mars. Corneille and Milton are "thrown one against the other" by the mobs celebrating the failure of the Richelieu plot; and when the crowd has passed, Corneille reads part of a letter which gives in detail the story of the beheadings.

Since it was obvious that Richelieu aimed only at power, Milton poses

the question, "Why did he not, if he was a genius, make himself absolute master of power?" There is no satisfactory answer; the conclusion of the story has been reached; and yet Milton must be got back to London. De Vigny brings matters to an end very abruptly by having Milton say: "I am going to see a man who is not yet known, and whom I see swayed by this miserable ambition; but I think he will go farther. His name is Cromwell." Milton does not even say good-bye to the friendly Corneille, and as far as the reader is informed, Corneille is still standing at the foot of the statue of Henri IV where he and Milton had so unexpectedly met.

In Benjamin Hérisson's *Une Entrevue de Corneille et Milton* (1836), the scene is the evening of the première of Corneille's *Le Cid*. The reactions of three persons at the play are described: Corneille, Richelieu, and a Stranger, who proves to be Milton, now passing through France on his way to Italy. At the height of the enthusiastic reception of the play, Milton cries out "bravo." Corneille remembers this when he is walking the streets in excitement after the play and is addressed by the Stranger, who has been following him. Milton is in an ecstasy, his eyes are flaming, and his praise is extravagant. The two characters are brought into sharp contrast by Hérisson as they stand talking under a streetlamp at midnight in Paris.

Riquier-Aldée's novel, which begins with the Italian journey, brings together in one work several of the incidents treated by other writers (such as the Davenant and Christopher stories already mentioned), and adds various romantic elements. After an invocation to the spirit of poesy, Aldée introduces Milton walking alone in the Apennines at evening. A "secret voice" tells him that France has "a miracle of Genius," for "Corneille va venir." Pale and breathless, Milton considers his own destiny; and in the words of those arguing for the superiority of the moderns over the ancients, he demands of Homer whether a young man of the "seizième [*sic*] siècle," with the philosophy and science of his time and of his country, and the added advantage of the Bible, might not achieve an even greater work than that of Homer.

A fictional love story holds together the other loosely organized materials which Aldée presents. This begins when Milton speaks to a young woman named Marie whom he sees gathering fruit in an orchard. Soon he is a frequent guest in Marie's home and enjoys the pastoral simplicity of her surroundings. This idyll is temporarily interrupted when a great lady, Vittoria, sees Milton at a concert and sends for him. Milton is "fascinated by her"; but he discovers that "Comme l'Eve au moment de sa chute, tu ne sembles née que pour le plaisir," and so they separate.

Milton becomes the approved suitor of Marie and spends much time reading Shakespeare to her. Marie, who cannot make up her mind to marriage, considers entering a convent; but even after Milton returns to England and is engaged in political activities, they correspond. Marie finally tells him to come and that she will be his wife; but since she has "the nature of an angel," she becomes ill at the idea of marriage and dies before Milton gets there. The only recompense is that Milton "visited perhaps by the spirit of Marie" grows to love good for itself.

As we have seen, the writers who portray Milton select or invent details that would be of particular interest to their period. They stress Milton's political involvement, and, especially, the friendship and magnanimity which is the basis of the Davenant story. They tell of his Continental journey and meeting with Galileo, but invent his discussions with the leading French poets and his excited contacts with Corneille. They reveal his ambition and show him concerned over the question which was then current regarding the possibility of the moderns' being superior to the ancients. They introduce a romantic love element, either through the imaginary love affair of young Milton abroad, as in Aldée's novel, or through stories of a romance between Milton's daughter and Davenant's son.

The passages from *Paradise Lost* chosen for inclusion in these works are those which are most nearly in accord with certain characteristics of the French Romantic period. In subject-matter the great demand was for pastoral romance, and therefore the popular scene in the poem was that in Book IV portraying the innocent love of Adam and Eve against the idyllic background of the Garden of Eden. Here the Arcadian setting, the "dream woman," and ideal love combined to stir the nostalgic yearnings of the romanticists. The situation had "sentiment," even though Scudéry was represented as ridiculing it for its lack of "grace, gallantry, and the *belle flamme*."

Other passages which are used in these representations of Milton reflect additional characteristics of the Romantic period. Milton's lines on his blindness at the beginning of Book III embody several. The personal note, which always had an especial appeal, here includes melancholy and pathos; and love of nature is expressed through the contrast between former visual enjoyment and present deprivation. The conclusion of Book X on the efficacy of repentance and prayer shows Adam's childlike religious faith, and was used in Dulcat's play to prove to Milton, the regicide, that if the heart were right, deeds could be forgotten. Thus Milton was incongruously brought to accept one of the convenient beliefs

of the romanticists. At a time when much emphasis was placed on the idea that the poet was mysteriously inspired, all the writers who introduced Milton as a personnage represented him as using inspired tones whenever he repeated lines of poetry.

Since the epic and blank verse were now out of date and the lyric was supreme, only those lines from *Paradise Lost* could be introduced which could be adapted to lyrical measures. We therefore find Milton repeating lines transformed into varied metres and rhyme schemes.

The Milton materials which the French writers did not use also reveal something concerning the period. Nothing so unpleasant as Milton's domestic troubles or his ill health appears in any of the literary treatments. The French people customarily hide their troubles and disabilities, and the representation of Milton's difficulties would have been disagreeable to them. Blindness has pathos, but the gout demanded silence.

In *Paradise Lost* the battle in Heaven, the expulsion of Satan's hosts, and the scenes in Hell were too excessive to be pleasing. These, together with the angelic visits to the Garden, violated Boileau's critical dicta against Christian supernatural epic "machines" and the treatment of biblical truth in a fictional manner. In the one scene in *Cinq-Mars* when Milton presents these parts of his poem to the salon audience, they are not only called in "false taste" but are also depicted as an intolerable violation of "religious scruples." The theology of *Paradise Lost* would not have been acceptable to the French, even if it had provided suitable material for inclusion in the literary types in which Milton appears. Telleen comments: "La théologie de Milton fut un des objects ordinaires de la censure des critiques."[7]

The presentation of Milton as a character in French literature parallels in the creative field the evidence of Milton's popularity provided by the great number of translations of his poems during the century. Not only is this view of Milton through the eyes of the French entertaining; it is also a revelation of French taste in the Romantic period.

NOTES

1 J. G. Robertson, "Milton's Fame on the Continent," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, III (1908), 338.

2 The story is told by Jonathan Richardson in his *Life of Milton* (1735) as having come from Pope who had heard it from Betterton, who supposedly

heard it direct from Davenant. This account was repeated by Newton and many others. Dr. Johnson in *Lives of the Poets* said, "Here is reciprocation of generosity and gratitude so pleasing, that the tale makes its own way to credit. But if help were wanted, I know not where to find it. . . . Betterton's narrative can be traced no higher; it is not known that he had it from Davenant."

3 Voltaire in his *Essay on Epic Poetry* (1827) says that Milton saw Andreini's *Adamo* in Florence and took from it "the first hint" of *Paradise Lost*. See *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, ed. Henry J. Todd, I (5th ed., 1852), 230.

4 This song proved to be very popular, and is found in collections of songs as a separate solo.

5 Alfred Loewenberg, *Annals of Opera 1597–1940* (Cambridge, 1943), 290.

6 This play, written in 1827, was considered unactable and was never produced until July 1956.

7 John Martin Telleen, *Milton dans la littérature française* (Paris, 1904), 109.

ANCIENT EGYPTIAN FOLK TALES

Ronald J. Williams

In his Schweich Lectures before the British Academy in 1929, the late Professor Peet stated, "Egypt . . . is the home of the short story, and one of her claims to literary recognition is that she produced the first short stories to be told for their own sake. Her stories are pure pastime, not propagandist or aetiological in origin."[1] It is indeed a fact that the Egyptian was always fond of a good story, and succeeded in telling it well.

Now the folk tale is a *genre* widely diffused throughout all lands and among all peoples. It plays the same rôle in the life of illiterate folk that the novel or short story does in educated society. As these tales pass orally from people to people and age to age they are modified and adapted to new situations; they receive accretions, and often incorporate or are assimilated to features in other tales. From time to time they may be written down, and then for a period they attain a relatively fixed form.

The Egyptians, who were the creators of the short story as a literary form, from very early times employed many such folk tales as the themes of their compositions. We shall examine some of these tales which make their first recorded appearance in ancient Egyptian literature, and follow their careers, either in the oral traditions of unlettered folk, or in the more sophisticated written literatures of later ages.

It is now more than a century since the first attempts were made to translate the Tale of the Two Brothers.[2] The manuscript, in Late Egyptian hieratic, was written about 1225 B.C., during the Nineteenth Dynasty. The story concerns two brothers who bore the names Anubis and Bata. The fact that these are names of Egyptian deities suggests that the tale had a mythological background. In the form in which it has reached us, the work is a skilful combination of two originally distinct tales.

The story opens with Bata living in the home of his married elder brother, and earning his keep by working for him in the fields. One day,

while they were in the field, they ran short of seed. He (i.e. Anubis) sent his younger brother, saying, "Go, fetch us seed from the village." His younger brother found his elder brother's wife sitting dressing her hair. So he said to her, "Get up and give me some seed, that I may go back to the field, for my elder[3] brother is waiting for me. Do not delay!" She said to him, "Go, open the bin and take what you want for yourself. Do not make me leave in the midst of my hairdressing." So the youth entered his stable and fetched a large jar, intending to take a great deal of seed. He loaded himself with barley and emmer and came out carrying them. She said to him, "How much do you have on your shoulder?" [He said] to her, "I have on my[4] shoulder three sacks of emmer and two of barley, a total of five." Thus he said to her, and she [spoke with him], saying, "You have great strength. I see your might daily," her intention being to make love to him. Then she got up and took hold of him, saying, "Come, let us spend an hour sleeping together. It will be to your advantage, for I will make you fine clothes." But the youth [became] like a leopard with [great] rage at the wicked proposal which she had made to him, so that she was very frightened. He spoke with her, saying, "Look! You are like a mother to me and your husband is like a father to me, for, being older than I, he has brought me up. What great crime is this that you have suggested to me? Do not suggest it to me again! I will tell it to no one, nor let it out of my mouth to any person." He then took up his load and went off to the field.

The following lines tell how Anubis returned home in the evening, while his younger brother remained behind to finish the chores. The story continues: "He found his wife lying down, feigning illness. She put no water on his hands as was his custom, nor had she lit (a lamp) in preparation for him, his house being in darkness." As we should expect, her husband was greatly incensed at her story, and resolved to slay his brother. The latter, on his return, was warned by the cattle (such talking beasts being a characteristic of this type of tale), and fled with Anubis in pursuit. Fortunately the sun-god Rē saved the fugitive by interposing between the brothers a lake infested with crocodiles. Bata took advantage of this respite to explain the true circumstances, and succeeded in convincing his brother of his innocence. As a result the faithless wife was put to death.

The striking resemblance of this first part of the Egyptian tale to the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife recounted in the thirty-ninth chapter of Genesis is so obvious that it need not be elaborated. There can be little doubt that Hebrew literature was here, as elsewhere, indebted to

an Egyptian prototype. This motif of the lustful wife and the virtuous youth who is wrongly accused finds its way also into Greek literature. In Book VI of the *Iliad* we learn of Bellerophon that

> the gods granted him beauty and lovely manhood. But Proetus plotted evil against him in his heart and drove him from the land of the Argives, since he was much stronger, Zeus having made them subject to his sceptre. Now Proetus' wife, fair Anteia, was mad for him and longed to lie with him secretly, but she could not persuade the wise Bellerophon because he was upright of heart. So she lied to King Proetus, "Proetus, die yourself, or else slay Bellerophon, since he wished to lie with me against my will." [ll. 156–65]

To summarize the remainder of the account, the king, fearing to slay Bellerophon himself, sent him to Lycia to Anteia's father with a document setting forth the details, in hopes that Bellerophon would be slain there. Our innocent hero, however, survived the four trials which were set him and lived to marry the king's daughter.

The theme reappears in Euripides' tragedy *Hippolytus*, produced in 428 B.C. It will be recalled how Phaedra, the young wife of Hippolytus' father Theseus, in consequence of the machinations of Aphrodite, fell in love with Hippolytus. Consumed by this illicit passion for her stepson, Phaedra committed suicide, but in revenge for her unrequited love left a note implicating Hippolytus. The latter was duly exiled and soon met a violent death, whereupon the goddess Artemis explained the true facts to his distracted father. Five years later Aristophanes' comedy *Clouds* made its appearance. In this he referred to another such story—that of Peleus who received a sword from the gods when he was exiled as a result of his rejection of the advances of Acastus' wife Hippolyte (ll. 1063–8). In Latin literature reference is made to both stories in an ode by Horace (iii. 7).

We must now return to the Egyptian tale and trace the further adventures of the two brothers. When we left them, Bata had persuaded his brother of his innocence. He then declared his intention to journey to the Valley of the Cedar where he would place his heart for safety in a cedar. In this connection, the remarks of Nilsson, the historian of Greek religion, are instructive. Speaking of the ψυχή, he says, "The life or the soul can be parted from its owner and deposited in some inaccessible place, and until it is discovered the owner cannot be killed."[5] Anubis was then warned that if a jug of beer frothed over, it would be a sign that a calamity had befallen his brother. He must then go in search of the heart and place it in water so that Bata might be restored to life.

After Bata reached the Valley of the Cedar, the gods created a wife

for him to ease his loneliness. However, by chance the Pharaoh discovered a lock of her hair which the sea had carried to the Egyptian court, and had her conveyed to his *harīm*. She persuaded the king to have the cedar cut down, so that with the fall of his heart Bata died. As predicted, the frothing jug of beer informed Anubis of the catastrophe. Setting out in search of Bata's heart, Anubis first found his brother's body and then a dessicated pine-cone which was heart-shaped. Giving this to his brother's corpse to drink in a jar of water, he restored him to life. Bata then transformed himself into a bull and, with Anubis on his back, set out to execute vengeance on his wife. When he revealed his identity to her, she had the bull slain, but two drops of blood which fell to the ground produced two persea trees. Bata, still living in these, again addressed his wife, whereupon she had them hewn down. However, a chip flew into her mouth, and she conceived a son who was none other than Bata. When the king died, he succeeded to the throne and finally was avenged on his faithless wife.

A remarkable parallel to this account is to be found in a Russian folk tale, narrated in Old Church Slavonic, which, though contained in a manuscript of the seventeenth century, may well be centuries earlier.[6] In translating portions of this *skazka* known as Ivan Ponomarevich (Ivan the Sexton's Son), we shall refer to the comparable passages in the Egyptian tale. The story begins by recounting the virtues of Ivan. These, together with his proficiency on the zither, reached the ears of the Turkish envoy, named Kuart, who determined to take him as a gift to the Sultan. A force of two hundred men arrived to seize Ivan who, as the text continues, "had no time to saddle his horse or take the iron mace, for the Turks had already surrounded his courtyard. Ivan, removing a fencepost, quickly leapt out and put all the two hundred men to death in his courtyard, leaving only two men alive. He said to them, 'Away, and tell your envoy Kuart all about me.' "

In the Egyptian tale, the Pharaoh sent a large force to bring Bata's wife to his court, and we read there:

> The men who had gone to other lands returned to report to His Majesty, but those who had gone to the Valley of the Cedar did not return, since Bata had slain them, leaving only one of them to report to His Majesty. Then His Majesty despatched many soldiers as well as chariotry to bring her back, and with them was a woman to whom had been entrusted every kind of lovely female adornment.

The Sultan similarly despatched a great force, numbering ten thousand, against Ivan. The Russian text continues:

As Ivan Ponomarevich heard the great arrival of the Turks against him, he went to the stable, saddled his fine horse and took the iron mace, saying to his father, "Father, I am going to battle against the Turks on my fine horse, but another valiant steed will remain in the stable. Should I be slain, this horse will stand in blood up to its knees; then you will saddle it and journey to me. This steed will bring you by itself to my dead body."

This recalls Bata's promise to his brother, "You will know that something <has happened> to me when you are given a jug of beer and it froths over. Do not delay longer when this happens to you."

The Turkish Sultan was less fortunate than the Egyptian Pharaoh, however, and again suffered the loss of his army. Ivan subsequently hired himself out to the service of a great prince of the mythical land of Arinar, armed with a magical steel sword which enabled him to vanquish first an army of eighty thousand, and then a force of one hundred thousand sent by the Sultan. The King of Arinar, learning of Ivan's prowess, married him to his daughter whose name, significantly, was Cleopatra, an Egyptian name which never occurs elsewhere in Russia during this period. On the king's death, Ivan succeeded to the throne.

Now the Sultan, anxious to gain Ivan's magic sword for himself, entered the capital with his pasha, both of them disguised as beggars. To quote the text again: "At the moment Ivan was engaged in a hunting expedition." So, too, in the Egyptian text, we read, "Long after this, Bata went hunting in accordance with his daily habit." The Russian tale continues:

The Sultan entered the city and reached the royal court begging for alms. Cleopatra began to give him alms. When the Sultan saw the beauteous Cleopatra, he said to her, "Show me, madam, the steel sword with which Ivan Ponomarevich wages war." She ordered it to be brought out.

It took twelve men to carry the sword, which the Sultan and his pasha promptly confiscated. They then laid siege to the city. When Ivan returned he gave battle but, deprived of his magical sword, was slain.

A similar interrogation takes place in the Egyptian tale:

The King spoke with her (i.e. Bata's wife) to make her tell the facts about her husband (since he had slain all the warriors). She said to His Majesty, "Have the cedar cut down and destroyed!" So soldiers were despatched with their weapons to cut down the cedar. When they reached the cedar, they cut off the blossom upon which was Bata's heart, and instantly he fell dead.

Then comes the search by Bata's brother who

entered his house and sat down to wash his hands. He was given a jug of beer which frothed over. . . . Then he took his staff and sandals as well as

his clothing and weapons, and set out to travel to the Valley of the Cedar. He entered his younger brother's castle and found his younger brother lying dead on his bed.

The corresponding passage in the Russian story tells how Ivan's father

went into the stable and the horse was standing up to its knees in blood. He began to weep, and saddling the fine steed, rode off, and this horse carried him to the dead body of his son.

At this point the horse instructed him to kill it and, when the ravens began to peck at it, to catch one and send it to fetch the "water of life and death." He did so, and the raven flew off. It forced the servants, who were washing the royal clothes, to provide it with two cups of the required water. This is surely a reminiscence of the royal washermen who found the lock of hair of Bata's wife. By means of this water, then, Ivan was restored to life, whereupon he declared, "I will finish off my enemy!" The Egyptian Bata, when revived by the soaking of his heart in a jar of water, likewise swore vengeance on his wife. Then he told his brother, "I <shall> become a great bull with all kinds of fine markings of an unknown kind" (i.e. unlike those of the various types of sacred bulls). When the king was informed about it, "he rejoiced greatly over him and offered a great sacrifice to him." When Bata disclosed his identity to his wife, it will be recalled, she persuaded the Pharaoh to have him slaughtered.

In the Russian version, Ivan transformed himself into a marvellous horse with a golden coat. The Sultan promptly bought it, but Cleopatra told him, "This is no horse; it is Ivan Ponomarevich! Command that he be cut down." When this was done, from his blood an ox with a golden hide appeared. Cleopatra recognized this, too, as Ivan and persuaded the Sultan to have him slaughtered. Meanwhile the ox had instructed a servant-girl to bury his head in the Sultan's garden. By morning an apple tree with golden apples had grown on the spot, just as from the two drops of blood in the Egyptian tale two persea trees had sprouted. Cleopatra, like her Egyptian counterpart, contrived to have the tree chopped down. In the Egyptian tale, a chip from the persea trees flew into the mouth of Bata's wife and resulted in his rebirth as a child. So in the Russian story it is a chip from the apple tree which, falling in the Sultan's pool, became a drake which flew onto the shore and was transformed into Ivan himself. The story ends, like the Egyptian one, with the death of the traitorous wife. Before leaving this tale, we may note that Anatole France had read the Egyptian story in Maspero's translation, and made reference to it in *Thaïs*.[7]

The second Egyptian work we shall consider is another Nineteenth Dynasty hieratic papyrus.[8] Unlike the contemporary Tale of the Two Brothers, however, this manuscript has suffered the loss of the opening pages. Again we encounter two brothers, this time named Truth and Falsehood. Such an allegorical tale with personified abstract ideas is unique in Egyptian literature and recalls the mediaeval French *Roman de la Rose*, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, or Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Moreover, as in the first Egyptian work, there is a mythological basis, for underlying the tale is the strife between the brother gods Osiris and Seth and the vengeance obtained by the former's son Horus.

The elder brother, Truth, has been entrusted with a magical knife belonging to Falsehood. Apparently the knife has been lost, for when the damaged text begins, Falsehood accused Truth of stealing it when he was unable to produce it. When Truth offered to replace it, his brother refused to accept a substitute, making extravagant claims for the original knife: "It has the mountain of El[9] as its blade, the trees of Coptus as its haft, the god's tomb as its sheath, and the cattle of Kar as its binding." Falsehood succeeded in convincing the divine tribunal of Truth's guilt and had the sentence of blinding pronounced upon him. Truth was then led to the desert to become a prey for lions, but through the faithfulness of his servants he was spared this fate.

As in the other story, a second motif is now introduced. A noblewoman, seeing him, became enamoured of his handsome appearance. As a result of this fleeting passion a son was born who was to avenge his father whom she had abandoned and made her door-keeper. This child, of outstanding appearance, was sent to school where he distinguished himself by his ability. However, he was tormented by his school mates who jeered at him for having no father. When he begged his mother to reveal the identity of his father, she pointed out the blind door-keeper to him. The boy inquired of his father the cause of his blindness and resolved to avenge him. This he did by leaving a fine ox in the custody of Falsehood's herdsman. When he later returned to claim it he learned, as he had expected, that Falsehood had appropriated his ox. He demanded its return and was offered his pick of Falsehood's herd, whereupon he replied that there was none to equal his own, for which he made extravagant claims to match the earlier ones by Falsehood:

> Is there any ox as large as my own ox? If it were to stand in Balamūn (a town in the Delta), the tuft of its tail would rest on the papyrus-reeds (i.e. the Delta marshes), one of its horns being on the mountain of the west and the other on the mountain of the east, and the Great River (i.e. the Nile) being its resting-place. There are born to it sixty calves each day.

So he haled Falsehood before the divine tribunal, but they were loathe to admit the existence of this ancient counterpart of Paul Bunyan's Blue Ox. He then asked whether such a knife as Falsehood claimed could ever have existed. Thus demonstrating that his father had been unjustly condemned, the youth persuaded the tribunal to sentence Falsehood to be blinded and made the door-keeper in Truth's house.

The main story here was to live on in many forms among many peoples. The original features of the story were four in number: (1) two main characters, one good, the other bad; (2) a quarrel between them; (3) the good man blinded by the evil one and abandoned; (4) the subsequent fate of the evil man. To these four, as time progressed, many further elements accrued: (1) the friends are usually on a journey; (2) the quarrel may take two forms, either a wager with regard to the supremacy of Truth or Falsehood, Justice or Injustice, true religion or false, etc., or strife over food; (3) in the case of the wager, three persons are asked for a verdict which is always in favour of Falsehood, Injustice, etc.; occasionally the sentence of blinding is reduced to the taking of the loser's money; (4) near a gallows or in a tree, the blind man witnesses an assembly of animals, birds, or demons (usually three); (5) this group discusses three topics: a cure for blindness, a cure for the illness of a princess (in most cases), and a remedy for the lack of water in a city; (6) the hero of the tale uses this knowledge to gain wealth and prestige.[10]

The theme appears in Hebrew form in manuscripts of the ninth and fourteenth centuries, although Gaster would date the original composition as early as the fifth century.[11] A Jew and a Gentile were arguing over the superiority of their two religions. The latter proposed that the one whose religion was deemed by others to be superior should take the loser's money, and it was so agreed. Satan appeared first in the form of an old man, then as a young man, and finally as another old man. Each time, when questioned, he decided in favour of the Gentile who then took the Jew's money. Alone in the open at night, the latter heard three demons conversing. One told of meeting a Jew and an Aramaean and of giving evidence in favour of the Gentile; the second told of an emperor's daughter who, after seven days' labour, was unable to give birth, and added that the leaves of a tree overhanging the throne, if squeezed on her nose, would remedy the situation; the third told of stopping up a well of a certain province and observed that it could be restored to use by slaying a black ox over the water. The Jew, armed with this knowledge, enabled the princess to give birth and was instrumental in putting the well into operation, for both of which tasks he was liberally rewarded. The next day he met the Gentile who had taken his money and told him

the secret of his newly acquired wealth, whereupon the Gentile betook himself to the same spot to see what he could learn, but was slain there by the enraged demons.

A fifteenth-century Latin manuscript tells the same story of two travellers who are named, as in the Egyptian prototype, *Veritas* and *Falsitas*.[12] From this source it was employed by the Hungarian Franciscan monk Pelbárt in a Latin sermon about the year 1490, although he gives the characters no names.[13] A rich, wicked man had a true and honest servant who declared *iustitia* to be preferable to *iniustitia* in the world. His master denied this and, after arguing for a time, they agreed that if the servant could successfully prove his case, he would receive two hundred guilders from his master, but if his master were proved right, the servant's eyes were to be put out. They went together to obtain a decision, coming first to a great merchant. When interrogated, he supported injustice, for without it he would be poor. A judge next decided similarly, then a bishop, and finally the king. When all had declared for injustice, the master put out his servant's eyes.

The blind man wandered about till he came to a tree where he lay down to rest. At midnight a group of demons appeared and each related what he had done. One claimed to have made injustice triumph over justice and told of the master and his servant, for which he was rewarded by the chief demon by being given a crown and being seated at his side on the throne. Another demon, envious that his colleague should be rewarded thus for so small a task, told of a plant growing beneath the tree which would restore the sight to blind eyes. When the demons left, the blind man plucked all the plants under the tree until he found the right one. With sight restored, he then made his way to the palace where the king's daughter had become blind. After healing her successfully, he was given the princess in marriage and much wealth in addition.

His former master learned of his exalted position and went to ask him how he had regained his sight, and was told of the plant. Eager to acquire further wealth, the master went in search of the plant. While he was so engaged, the demons assembled and began to search for anyone lurking there, since they had been tricked before by the blind servant. On finding the unfortunate master there, they seized him and tore him to bits.

Another Franciscan, Johannes Pauli, retold the story in German, and it was published in 1522 in his celebrated collection *Schimpf und Ernst*.[14] Several Russian versions also survive which were collected in the mid nineteenth century. One, from Astrakhan, also names the two men *Pravda* and *Krivda* (Truth and Falsehood).[15] Making a wager as to

who would have the better success in life, *Krivda*, by bribing the court clerk, managed to win the judgment. In consequence of their agreement, *Pravda* lost his eyes, but managed to crawl to a swamp, where he remained. At midnight the evil spirits held a rendezvous with *Krivda* and asked who had done the greatest evil. *Krivda* recounted his actions, and the spirits disclosed a cure for blindness. *Pravda* overheard them and found the type of grass they mentioned. When he could once more see, he took the grass with him and cured the Czar's daughter who had been given up by all the physicians. As a reward, *Pravda* was given the princess in marriage.

A second Russian version comes from Kazan.[16] There were two brothers, poor peasants; one lived by *pravda*, the other by *krivda*. Arguing over which was the more profitable conduct, they agreed to ask the first three persons they met to decide the question. First they encountered a nobleman's serf, who replied that it was impossible to live by truth. Since he was always working for his master, he had no time to work for himself and was even forced to go surreptitiously to the wood by night to collect fuel. The next person was a merchant, who replied that it was difficult to live honestly. "We are swindled," he said, "so we swindle, too!" The third person was a government official, who snapped, "What is truth nowadays? You land in Siberia for the sake of truth!" Yet the honest peasant insisted, "One must live as God commands. What will be, will be, but I do not wish to live by dishonesty."

So the two continued on their way. The dishonest man, craftily accommodating himself to the occasion, was well fed. His honest brother, however, got little to eat and grew increasingly hungry. Finally he begged a piece of bread from his brother and was told that he must surrender one eye in exchange. In desperation he agreed. After a time the pangs of hunger again forced him to make a similar request and so he lost his second eye, despite his entreaties. At this point he was deserted by his brother, and finally lost his way. Then, praying to God, he heard a voice telling him to turn right to a forest and to follow a path until he reached a bubbling spring where he was to bathe his eyes and thus regain his sight. Then he was to proceed to a great oak tree and remain in it until nightfall, when he was to listen to what the unclean spirits would say beneath the tree. He carried out all the instructions, restored his sight, and heard the spirits telling of their feats. One related how he had entered a princess and plagued her for ten years, adding that only one thing could exorcize him, namely, the image of Our Lady of Smolensk which must be obtained from the gateway of a certain merchant.

In the morning the man clambered down and searched for the mer-

chant. On finding him, he requested that he might work for him, receiving no recompense except the image of Our Lady. At the end of a year's work he claimed the image, but the merchant, although satisfied with his work, was loathe to give up the icon and insisted on giving him money. So he went to work for a second year with the same result. Finally, after the third year, the merchant agreed to give up the image. With it the peasant then drove out the demon possessing the princess. The Czar offered the peasant an estate and great sums of money, but the peasant desired no reward. The princess then announced that she would wed him, and with the Czar's blessing they were married.

After a time the former peasant wished to return to his home where his aged mother still lived in poverty. Together with his bride he set off in regal splendour. On his arrival he encountered his dishonest brother and called him by name, but the latter failed to recognize him in his royal garb and noble equipage. The honest man then reminded him of their dispute and how his eyes had been put out. His brother was aghast, but the former assured him that he bore no rancour and wished him only happiness. He gave him the same directions he had received from the divine voice, so that his brother might learn of his fortune from the spirits. However, when he had done so, the demons heard him and tore him to bits.

The influence of these Russian tales is seen in Finnish stories where the characters are given such names as *Priuda* and *Prauda*, *Riuda* and *Rauda*, a clear corruption of the Russian *Pravda* and *Krivda*. Over three hundred forms of this folk tale have been recorded, including the famous version by the Grimm brothers.[17]

Let us, then, return to the Egyptian tale and recall the second motif of the infatuated woman and her son, whose life at school was made so unbearable by his companions. The motif recurs in the famous Arabic collection, the *Thousand and One Nights*.[18] Two brothers, we are told, shared the vizierate of Egypt. They quarrelled, and the younger, Nūr ad-Dīn 'Alī, set out for Bosra where he married and settled down, eventually becoming vizier there. He had a son, while his brother Shams ad-Dīn Muhammad had a daughter born the same day in Cairo. Nūr ad-Dīn died when his son Badr ad-Dīn Hassan was fifteen. The latter, mourning for his father, neglected his duties and incurred the wrath of the Sultan, whereupon he was forced to flee.

Now the Sultan of Egypt, angered by the refusal of his vizier Shams ad-Dīn to marry his daughter to him because he had vowed that she should wed her unknown cousin Badr ad-Dīn, determined to force her to marry a hunchbacked groom. However, a pair of *jinns* conspired to

transport Badr ad-Dīn from Bosra to Cairo and contrived to introduce him into the wedding celebrations where he and his cousin, the beautiful bride, fell instantly in love. The *jinns* then arranged that he should replace the hunchback on the wedding night. Ere dawn came, however, the sleeping Badr ad-Dīn was conveyed by the same *jinns* to Damascus. In time Sitt al-Husn (the Lady of Beauty) gave birth to Badr ad-Dīn's son, a handsome child who was appropriately named *'Ajīb*, "marvel."

At the age of seven the child was sent to school where he remained four years until, in the words of the tale,

> he began to fight with the school children and hurt them, saying to them, "Which of you is like me? I am the son of the Vizier of Egypt." The lads then went in a body to complain to the school-master of what they had suffered from 'Ajīb. The master said to them, "I shall tell you what to say to him, so that, when he comes, he will give up coming to school. This is it: when he comes tomorrow, sit down around him and say to the others, "By God, no one shall play this game with us unless he tells us the names of his father and mother. The one who does not know the names of his father and mother is illegitimate and shall not play with us."

They did so, and the various lads gave their parents' names. When 'Ajīb's turn came, he said,

> "My name is 'Ajīb, my mother is Sitt al-Husn and my father is Shams ad-Dīn, who is Vizier in Egypt." "By God," they cried, "the Vizier is not your father!" 'Ajīb said, "The Vizier certainly is my father!" Whereupon the lads laughed at him and said, "You don't know your father!"

Their jeering left him weeping with chagrin. The master then went on to explain that the Vizier was 'Ajīb's grandfather, and the boy then ran to his mother to inquire who his father was.

Not only is it significant that the action of this story takes place in Egypt, but both the Egyptian and Arabic accounts share the following common features: (1) each woman becomes pregnant after a single night with a man who then disappears from her life; (2) each gives birth to a son, in the Egyptian account "like a young god," in the Arabic named "Marvel"; (3) both sons are sent to school, not privately tutored, and distinguish themselves, one by his learning, the other by his pride and bullying; (4) the boys at school mock both lads for their unknown paternity; (5) both lads have recourse to their mothers to ascertain the truth.

The third and last Egyptian folk tale to be considered is contained in a demotic manuscript of the first century A.D.[19] Although the manuscript is of Roman date, the story it contains is purely Egyptian in character and preserves elements that go back to a great antiquity.

One day a man, known only by his priestly title Setōm,

heard the sound of [very loud] wailing [for the dead]. He looked [from the balcony] of his house [and saw a rich man] who was being carried out to the desert (necropolis) with [very loud] wailing, . . . great honour [and rich burial]. He looked [behind] him at his feet and saw [a poor man who was being carried out from Memphis to the desert (necropolis)] wrapped in a mat . . . with no [person at all] walking behind him. The Setōm [said], "As [the great god Ptah] lives, [it is much better for rich men] for whom [great honour is done] with the sound of [wailing], than for poor men who are carried to the desert. . . ."

His son Si-Osiris then said to him, "[May you be treated in the West (i.e. the underworld)] just as this poor man will be treated in the West!" The text now becomes too fragmentary for connected translation, but we can make out that the Setōm was greatly troubled. Si-Osiris, who had outstanding magical powers, led his father into the underworld, and they passed through the various halls. At the point when they reached the fourth hall the text again becomes intelligible:

[The Setōm saw some men who were twisting ropes while asses were gnawing at them], and some others whose food, water, and bread were suspended above them, hastening to take them down, while some others were digging pits at their feet to prevent them from reaching them. They went to the fifth hall. The Setōm saw the noble spirits standing in their appropriate places, and those who bore(?) the charges of violence standing at the entrance praying, while the pivot of the door of the fifth hall was fixed in the right eye of one man who was praying and uttering loud cries.

At this juncture it would be well to point out that the motif of a door pivot in a man's eye is found very early in Egypt. An example of a stone door-socket in the form of an enemy with the pivot fitting in the neck goes back at least to the First Dynasty, *ca.* 3,000 B.C.[20]

Returning to the story, we see the pair passing on until they reached the seventh hall. Here the tribunal of the gods was standing. The text goes on:

The scales were set up in their midst, and the evil deeds were weighed against the good, while the great god Thoth wrote (it) down as Anubis gave his colleague the verdict. He whose evil deeds shall be found to be more numerous than his good ones shall become the portion of the Lord of the West's Devourer,[21] his soul being destroyed together with his body. . . . But he whose good deeds shall be found to be more numerous than his evil ones shall be brought amongst the gods of the tribunal of the Lord of the West, his soul going to the sky with the noble spirits. . . .

The Setōm saw a rich man, clothed in a garment of byssus, near the place where Osiris was, his position being a very great one. . . . Si-Osiris said to

him, "My father Setōm, do you not see this rich man clothed in a garment of byssus and near the place where Osiris is? He is that poor man whom you saw being carried out from Memphis with no one walking behind him, and wrapped in a mat. He was brought to the underworld and his evil deeds weighed against the good ones."

Then, we are told, because the latter exceeded the former, "orders were given before Osiris that the burial equipment of that rich man whom you saw being brought out from Memphis, with great honour being paid him, should be transferred to this aforementioned poor man and that he should be brought amongst the noble spirits as a person belonging to God." The text goes on to relate how the rich man's evil deeds preponderated and continues, "He [is that man whom you] saw with the pivot of the door of the West fixed in his right eye." The Setōm, greatly impressed by what he saw, asked the meaning of it all, to which his son replied,

Those men whom you saw who were twisting ropes while the asses were gnawing at them are identical with the men on earth who are under the god's curse, working night and day for their livelihood, while their wives rob them behind their backs and they find no bread to eat. . . . Furthermore, those other men whom you saw, whose food, water and bread were suspended above them, and who were hastening to take them down, while still others were digging pits at their feet to prevent them from reaching them <are> identical with the men on earth whose life is before them, but the god digs a pit at their feet to prevent them from finding it. . . . To him who is beneficent on earth they (i.e. the gods) are beneficent in the West, while to him who is evil they are evil. These things are fixed [and can] never [be altered].

In Greece of the fifth century B.C. there is a remarkable illustration of this story. Polygnotus, the painter, executed a series of frescoes in the Lesché at Delphi depicting Odysseus' visit to Hades. Although the paintings have long since perished, a description of them by Pausanias in the late second century A.D. has survived.[22] Pausanias says,

After them (i.e. the figures in the picture) a man is sitting whom the inscription declares to be Ocnus (i.e. indolence). He is depicted as twisting a rope, and near him stands a she-ass devouring the rope as fast as it is twisted. They say that this Ocnus was an industrious man, but had an extravagant wife, and whatever he amassed by his labour was quickly spent by his wife. Hence they wish (to suggest) that Polygnotus has painted (it) with reference to Ocnus' wife.

A reference to this painting appears also in the writings of Plutarch.[23] Propertius, in one of his elegies, describes a man as "more deserving than Ocnus to sit sideways and twist the rope, and to feed thy hungry maw, poor ass, to all eternity."[24]

The question arises whether the Greek concept of the afterlife could possibly have produced such a scene, or could have accounted for the Tantalus motif in the Odyssey. It is for this very reason that Page has recently declared such ideas to be an aberration, and the Homeric passages dealing with the visit to Hades to be interpolations.[25] May we not regard them, together with the unique sixth-century vase painting of a winged *psyche*,[26] as manifesting the thought-world of Egypt, where ideas of immortality, judgment, retribution, and the winged soul were fully established?

The story was transmitted to Hebrew literature, probably through the Jews in Alexandria or Memphis.[27] We have seven Hebrew or Aramaic versions bringing us down to the thirteenth century. The Aramaic version to be translated must be dated in its present form to about A.D. 300, because of the rabbis mentioned, but the variants in some other versions indicate that the tale is much earlier.[28]

> Two pious men lived in Ashkelon, eating, drinking, and studying the Torah together. One of them passed away, but he was not shown kindness (i.e. given an honourable funeral). Bar-Ma'īn, the tax-gatherer, died and the whole city ceased from work in order to show him kindness. The (other) pious man began to grieve, saying, "Alas, Israel has nothing at all!" In a dream one appeared to him, saying, "My son, do not show contempt for your Lord! One has committed one sin and has departed in it; the other performed one good deed and has departed in it." "What sin, then, did that pious man commit?" "During his lifetime he committed no sin except that once he put on the head-phylactery before the hand-phylactery." "What good deed, then, did Bar-Ma'īn the tax-gatherer perform?" "During his lifetime he performed no good deed except that one time he gave a dinner for the councillors, and when they did not come and eat it, he said, 'Let the poor eat it that it may not be lost.' Others say that when he was passing along the street he dropped a loaf. A poor man saw it and picked it up, but he said nothing to him in order not to embarrass him."
>
> After a time that pious man saw his pious friend walking about in a garden in Paradise between springs of water. He saw Bar-Ma'īn, the tax-gatherer, standing on the river-bank wishing to reach the water, but not succeeding. He then saw Miriam, the daughter of 'Alê-Besālīm. R. Eleazar b. Jose says she was suspended by the breasts; R. Jose b. Hanina says the pivot of the gate of Hell was fixed in her ear. He said, "What is the reason for this?" and he was told, "Because she was fasting and making it public." Others say, "Because she was fasting for one day but marking it down as two." He said, "How long is this to last?" and he was told, "Until Simeon b. Shetach comes; then we shall take it out of her ear and fix it in his!"

It was, finally, one such Jewish version that prompted Jesus' use of the old folk tale in the parable of Dives and Lazarus recorded in Luke 16:19–31.

We have examined but three tales from ancient Egypt, yet we have seen that their influence has spread far in time and space. Space forbids further detailed illustration of the fertility of the Egyptian mind in creating motifs which were to capture the imagination of later peoples. It must suffice merely to mention the Tale of the Doomed Prince,[29] with its motifs of the wicked stepmother and of the youth adventuring in the world and gaining the fair princess; the Story of the Herdsman[30] and the *Lorelei* motif; the Tale of the Capture of Joppa[31] and the earliest form of the motif of the Trojan Horse, found also in the Arabic tale of 'Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves; or the Egyptian Tale of Rhampsinitus preserved by Herodotus (Book II.121), introducing the motif of the master-thief. And so we could go on!

This is only a part of the debt we owe to Egypt. Elsewhere the present writer has shown her influence on the fable traditions of later ages.[32] The didactic compositions and love poems of Egypt were likewise to leave their mark on world literature. Even medical recipes from Egyptian papyri have been traced down to mediaeval Europe. When we recall, furthermore, that Egypt bequeathed us our calendar and was the source from which our modern alphabetic scripts were ultimately derived, we must pay tribute to the remarkably creative minds of the people of ancient Egypt.

NOTES

1 T. E. Peet, *A Comparative Study of the Literatures of Egypt, Palestine and Mesopotamia* (London, 1931), 27.

2 By E. de Rougé in 1852. Text published in *Select Papyri in the Hieratic Character from the Collections of the British Museum*, II (London, 1860), Plates IX–XIX; translated by A. Erman, *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians* (London, 1927), 150–61, and most recently by J. A. Wilson in J. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (2nd ed.; Princeton, 1955), 23–5. All translations in this paper are those of the present writer.

3 So read; the scribe has erroneously written "younger."

4 So read; the text mistakenly has "your."

5 M. P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion* (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1949), 53.

6 N. Kostomarov, ed., *Pamyatniki starinnoi russkoi literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1860), 319–22; cf. G. Lefebvre, *Chronique d'Egypte*, XXV (1950), 17–26.

7 *Thaïs* (1920 ed.), 240.

8 Sir A. H. Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, Third Series (London, 1935), vol. I, Plates 1–4; vol. II, pp. 2–6.

9 The chief god of the Canaanite pantheon.

10 R. T. Christiansen, "The Tale of the Two Travellers," *Folklore Fellows Communications*, XXIV (Hamina, 1916).

11 M. Gaster, *The Exempla of the Rabbis* (London, Leipzig, 1924), no. 29, pp. *21 f.; translated in *Folk-Lore*, VII (1896), 231 f.

12 Known as "Magister Esopianus et Avianus," and printed in L. Katona, *Temesvári Pelbárt példái* (Budapest, 1902), 36.

13 *Ibid.*, 35 f.; also quoted in J. Bolte and G. Polívka, *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm* (Leipzig, 1915), II, 471 f.

14 J. Bolte, ed., *Schimpf und Ernst*, vol. I (Berlin, 1924), no. 64, p. 283.

15 A. N. Afanasiev, *Narodnyje russkije skazki* (Moscow, 1957), vol. I, no. 117, pp. 196–7.

16 *Ibid.*, no. 115, pp. 191–5.

17 J. and W. Grimm, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* (Berlin, 1888), no. 107; cf. also J. Bolte, *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, III (1931), 172; M. Pieper, *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, LXX (1934), 92.

18 Cairo edition, I, 76 f.; cf. G. Lefebvre, *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1943), 74–84.

19 F. Ll. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis* (Oxford, 1900), 142–207.

20 J. E. Quibell, *Hierakonpolis* (London, 1900), Plate 3.

21 A terrifying hybrid monster, part crocodile, lion, and hippopotamus.

22 *Graeciae descriptio*, X.29, 1 f.

23 *De tranquillitate animi*, 473C; a similar scene by the painter Socrates is mentioned by Pliny, *Historiae naturalis*, XXXV.137.

24 *Elegies*, IV.3, 21 f.:

> *dignior obliquo funem qui torqueat Ocno*
> *aeternusque tuam pascat, aselle, famem.*

25 D. Page, *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford, 1955), 48, fn. 6.

26 E. Gerhard, *Auserlesene griechische Vasenbilder* (Berlin, 1840–58), vol. II, Plate 107.

27 H. Gressmann, "Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus," *Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Philosophisch-historische Klasse (1918), no. 7.

28 Pal. Chagiga, II, 77d = Pal. Sanhedrin, VI, 23c.

29 Trans. by T. E. Peet, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XI (1925), 227–9.

30 Sir A. H. Gardiner, *Die Erzählung des Sinuhe und die Hirtengeschichte* (Leipzig, 1909), p. 15, Plates 16 f.

31 Trans. by T. E. Peet, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XI (1925), 226 f.

32 "The Fable in the Ancient Near East," in E. C. Hobbs, ed., *A Stubborn Faith* (Dallas, 1956), 3–26.

WILLA CATHER'S PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST

Edward A. Bloom
Lillian D. Bloom

Drawing upon her own artistic convictions and practice, Willa Cather once asserted that there are "only two or three human stories, and they go on repeating themselves fiercely as if they had never happened before." Specifically her many novels and volumes of short stories reveal that for her there were only three major themes, but all interrelated through a common aesthetico-moral bond. Two of the themes have to do with the inspiration of the pioneer experience and, because of material considerations, the corruption of that experience. The third concerns the artist who, like the pioneer, undergoes the crises of self-discovery, struggle, and ultimate spiritual triumph. Throughout her life Willa Cather was intrigued by the portrait of the artist. In her early literary productions at the University of Nebraska, where she was an undergraduate, she often wrote analytically about artistic genius. Although her analyses were not profound, they expressed a sensitivity and an enthusiasm alternating between awe and hostility. At *McClure's*, where she worked as an editor, her most important articles were those in which she interpreted the personal histories of the great productive artists of the time. Her first collection of short stories, *The Troll Garden*, is primarily an extended colloquy between the artist as hero and a personified middle-class society as the villain. And in her more lasting accomplishments—*The Song of the Lark*, *Lucy Gayheart*, and *Youth and the Bright Medusa*—she devoted herself exclusively to the thematic development of the artist as an individual.

The artists in Willa Cather's spiritual hierarchy—whether fictional or real—are given a fitting eminence for their greatness of spirit. Endowing them with remarkable sanctity of purpose, she insists almost fiercely that they are pilgrims of imagination, driven by a single mission. All of her artists are urged forward by their inner need to seek and find a direction of life, their art being the instrument by which they guide them-

selves. Without external or materialistic prompting, her seekers press towards an aesthetic ideal, or perhaps vision, that blossoms into creative power rich in both imagination and spiritual values. Creativeness, she says in *The Professor's House*, is a "magical element" born of the inner quest. Serving as a prototype of her fictional artists, Miss Cather denied that genuine artistry may be diluted. By personality and ability "uncommon, in a common, common world," the artist will not compromise with debilitating materialism or meretricious physical power. Even the ultimate rewards of the artist are intangible. For that matter, Miss Cather is not sure that the rewards which count are ever definable as anything other than a vague sense of exultation after a long and arduous search. Her attitude bears comparison with the reaction described by Proust after he had composed his first successful page:

> At the moment when . . . I had finished writing it, I found such a state of happiness, felt that it had so entirely relieved my mind of an obsession . . . that, as though I myself were a hen and had just laid an egg, I began to sing at the top of my voice.

If Miss Cather and her artists were less fanciful about their own creative efforts, they were at least as jubilant.

"The eternal mind," as Proust alluded to the continuity of art, becomes the controlling urge for Miss Cather's creative seekers. Because there is no end to art and no beginning, each artist represents a link with those who have gone before and with those who are yet to come. Especially in *The Song of the Lark*, Miss Cather eulogizes art as a transcendent voice. The desire which precedes and complements artistic creation and fulfilment is a refraction of infinity, obsessive in its need "to imprison for a moment the shining, elusive element which is life itself—life hurrying past us and running away, too strong to stop, too sweet to lose." At the moment of her artistic awakening, which is also her moment of dedication, Thea Kronborg beholds the broken clay vessels of the ancient cliff-dwellers. Emotionally and intellectually responsive to an ineffable longing stirred by these relics, she identifies herself with the irrefrangible continuity of art.

> A dream had been dreamed there [in the cliff-dwellings] long ago, in the night of ages, and the wind had whispered some promise to the sadness of the savage. In their own way, these people had felt the beginnings of what was to come. These potsherds were like fetters that bound one to a long chain of human endeavor.

Through her fictional artists Miss Cather exalted the historical sense which underlies the creation of mature art, for basic to the latter is the

realization that no artist is an entity in and of himself. As T. S. Eliot says, the artist's "significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists."

II

Willa Cather was interested in the artist's psychological development. Although she had a deep concern for mature accomplishment, she was fascinated by the process of growth from the seed. In a candid preface she wrote that the chief fault of *The Song of the Lark* "is that it describes a descending curve; the life of a successful artist in the full tide of achievement is not so interesting as the life of a talented young girl 'fighting her way,' as we say." Thea's story, she felt, was of dramatic interest only during her "awakening and struggle; her floundering escape from a smug, domestic, self-satisfied provincial world of utter ignorance." As Thea's imaginative life became enriched, her personal life became pale. What Miss Cather "cared about . . . was the girl's escape," her liberation from commonness. What followed thereafter, inevitable triumph and reward, was good; but the excitement of struggle had ended and success was anticlimax.

She yearned to know and understand the creative essence which lodged itself within an arbitrarily chosen body and refused to be denied. Between 1896 and 1901, while she was living in Pittsburgh, she frequently made the long, uncomfortable trip to New York to hear the great singers of that era—Melba, Nordica, Schumann-Heink, Sembrich, Calve, Campanari, the De Reszkes. They interested her, of course, as performers; but even more, they interested her as artists who had succeeded after long effort and tenacity of purpose, like her own later heroines—Thea, or Cressida Garnet, or Kitty Ayrshire—despite every conceivable obstacle.

Individual artistic genius Miss Cather was always able to recognize as an incontrovertible fact. But in the definition of genius and its origins she wavered. Negatively, at least, she had the certitude that creative genius was never an environmental or inherited quality. Unwilling to commit herself positively, she nevertheless hinted at divine or miraculous origination. For instance, in "The Sculptor's Funeral" she sees the artist's genius as part of the "inscrutable wisdom of God." In another early short story, "The Treasure of Far Island" (*New England Magazine*, Oct. 1902), she calls it one of the "dark things" ordered by a

"dread Providence." Miss Cather's concern for the source of genius emerged early out of the awareness of her own artistic strength and her groping development. Later, assured by her growing powers, she ceased to speculate about the inception of this gift. Like her classical and Renaissance predecessors, she acknowledged an ineffable origin and rejoiced in it.

Little though she deliberated about the source of innate genius, her beliefs are clear enough. The artist's physical birth is important only because it provides the housing, the physical centre, for his intangible genius. Impelled by the creative mystery which is peculiarly his own, the artist emerges from his own begetting. Aesthetically self-sufficient, he creates himself, his imaginative life having little to do with physical being and processes. The stages from germination through delivery are long and difficult. "Every artist makes himself born," Miss Cather states in *The Song of the Lark*. "It is much harder than the other time and longer." This process of self-creation, moreover, gives to the artist a sense of his independence which is denied to other human beings. Devoid of any notion of social obligation, the artist is exultantly free to express that which he alone can express. In short, "if one became an artist one had to be born again, and . . . one owed nothing to anybody." For her own secular purposes, Miss Cather has virtually paraphrased the Gospel according to St. John on the necessity of regeneration: "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God" (3:3), and "Ye must be born again" (3:7). To "become" an artist means to fulfil that capacity which one already has. According to Miss Cather's creed, he who possesses this intuitive faculty must understand himself. Recognizing the prize of which he is guardian, he must commit himself to unsparing discipline for its loftiest expression; and he must recast his communal values in order to justify his aloneness. Objectively, Miss Cather must be reproached for the faults of egotism and aloofness. Yet she would condone these traits as necessarily inseparable from the nature of the artist. This is why she charges the artist "to be born again."

The artist, further, is as little responsible to his environment as he is to heritage of birth. The splendid fact that creative genius is innate cancels any possible debt to physical surroundings. Miss Cather actually holds that environment is a constant impediment, and that part of the miracle of genius inheres in the artist's ability to transcend physical limitations. For this reason Miss Cather projects her artists against a background which is sometimes almost malevolently hostile. In the early short stories, such as "The Sculptor's Funeral," which she wrote before she had an intimate knowledge of serious artists, Willa Cather

deplored the failure of the artist's family and society to understand him as ruinous to his personal life and even to his talent. But as she became a friend of people like the singer Olive Fremstad and the actor George Arliss, she discovered that she had underestimated the artistic temperament. Realization of the artist's toughness and resilience brought her to the knowledge that his talent could not be destroyed and his life embittered just because shrewd scoundrels exploited him, or ignorant people thought him a fool. Nevertheless, superficially abrasive though the effects of external environment might be, Miss Cather did not minimize or palliate them. The Sculptor is born into the ugliness of a tamed prairie, a "place of hatred and bitter waters." Thea Kronborg and Lucy Gayheart are born into the provincially sterile world of the "bitter, dead little Western town." Paul grows up in the comparable tastelessness and aesthetic barrenness of the middle-class city. Prairie farm, western village, eastern city—all are dissimilar in appearance yet alike in their automatic rejection of the artistic challenge.

Acutely aware that the nature of genius is too individual to lend itself to ready definition, Miss Cather generalized from her intuitive responses to particular instances. Consistently, she traced the creative propensity and its strength to inner sources. She concluded that the artist feeds upon himself, that inspiration and fulfilment come from within. Observing Madame Fremstad, she realized that the singer "gets very little from people; she does not catch ideas or suggestions from what she sees or hears; everything comes from within herself."[1] Miss Cather would have said that creative genius is a compound of heart and brain, emotion and mind, undissipated and concentrated in its ability to translate the objectivity of truth into terms of highly subjective response. Thus, "the great dancer is made, like any other artist, of two things: of a universal human impulse, and a very special and individual experience of it. That this very special experience creates ambition, devotion, very special skill, goes without saying. This is true in any art."[2]

As artistic genius must be self-sustaining in all other respects, so must it be responsible for its own psychological stimulus. Manifold in nature and complex in function, this stimulus is summed up by Miss Cather in the term "desire." The concept, virtually a metaphysical one that embraces a reverent attitude towards perfectibility, is often expressed in her fiction. Despite Miss Cather's individual manipulation and interpretation of this concept, its source is undoubtedly Platonic. "Desire," Plato said, "is stronger than necessity," and it has the power of luring one inexorably towards unseen goals. With its "origin in the soul," desire unites pleasure and pain, "pleasure in hope and pain in vacuity."

Desire, as Miss Cather interprets it in her short story "The Garden Lodge," is "a sort of mystic worship of things distant, intangible and unattainable." The mere recognition of the desire within oneself brings with it an eternal joy. In the summer of 1902, when Miss Cather was experiencing vague stirrings of her own artistic desire, she watched from the terrace of a hotel in Dieppe "a little boy . . . flying a red and green kite, quite the most magnificent kite I have ever seen, and it went up famously, up and up until his string ran short and of a truth one's heart went just as high." A symbol of her own daedalian yearning, this kite was never forgotten. It appears some thirty-three years later in modified form when Lucy Gayheart, as uncertain of her artistic future as was the young Willa Cather, sees from her sleigh the first star in the wintry sky. It "brought her heart into her throat. . . . That joy of saluting what is far above one was an eternal thing, not merely something that had happened to her ignorant and foolish heart." Desire is an inseparable part of the totality of creative genius, a stimulus for creation and self-revelation that dwarfs every other need. "Nothing is far and nothing is near," Miss Cather writes in *The Song of the Lark*, "if one desires. The world is little, people are little, human life is little. There is only one big thing—desire. And before it, when it is big, all is little." Translated into achievement, desire becomes the "glorious striving of human art."

Paradoxically, though desire is at its inception and source individual, it may be in its manifestations universal, unlimited by time and place, and indestructible. Though the cliff-dwellers of *The Song of the Lark* have become a "vanished race," "along the trails, in the streams, under the spreading cactus, there still glittered in the sun the bits of their frail clay vessels, fragments of their desire." Standing among these ruins, Thea miraculously absorbs the spirit of these primitive people and she fuses their ambition and effort with her own. In a more immediate identification, desire may even be transmitted from one individual to another. Kitty Ayrshire, the artist in "A Gold Slipper," says:

> I give money and time and effort to talented students. Oh, I give something more than that! . . . I give to the really gifted ones, my *wish*, my desire, my light, if I have any; and that . . . is like giving one's blood!

That this power can be transferred only to the gifted by the gifted is true because desire itself is the artist's passionate, undeviating devotion to an ideal. Receptivity to this power cannot be simulated and, Miss Cather asserts in *The Song of the Lark*, "like heroism it [is] inimitable in cheap materials." And, finally, it is in the nature of desire to be tumultuous or to cause tumult, to be radical or to cause radicalism. Its

possession compels the artist like Thea to reject the secure and the conventional. Since genius insists on expression, "the old highroad of life, worn safe and easy, hugging the sunny slopes," must be abandoned for the new and daring.

Co-existent with the creative force—its possession and the desire to express it—is the awakening within the artist of his creative self. Yet the awakening, like the full manifestation of the power, is a gradual one which carries its own gratification. At first the artist becomes aware of only gleams of promise, which seem almost foreign and temporarily elusive. Lucy Gayheart often had "run out on a spring morning, into the orchard, down the street, in pursuit of something she could not see, but knew! It was there, in the breeze, in the sun; it hid behind the blooming apple boughs, raced before her through the neighbour's gardens, but she could never catch up with it." As the artist's awakening becomes more pronounced, the essence of his talents becomes clearer to him. He realizes that he is unlike other people, that he is "possessed" not by a demon but by a "friendly spirit . . . that [is] a part of [himself]." From these moments of understanding is born the artist's happiness. Thea Kronborg communicated with her friendly spirit and was rewarded.

> The something came and went, she never knew how. Sometimes she hunted for it and could not find it; again, she lifted her eyes from a book or stepped out of doors, or wakened in the morning, and it was there,—under her cheek it usually seemed to be, or over her breast,—a kind of warm sureness. And when it was there, everything was more interesting and beautiful, even people.

With the final stages of his awakening, the artist achieves a certainty about his mission, if about nothing else. Distrustful of most things, he has no doubts about his work. "He was sure enough there," we are told in "The Sculptor's Funeral."

The recognition of artistic strength brings its own sense of responsibility, which can be asserted only through discipline. Like every aspect of creativeness, the need for discipline arises from an inner awareness. As a "power of application" or a "rugged will," this kind of regulatory control is superficially negative, for it serves to isolate the artist from the world about him. Observing Thea's puritanical rigidity, Professor Wunsch concludes that the artist's discipline repudiated the expedient, comfortable standards of ordinary life, the economic Darwinism of early twentieth-century America. Once again it was Madame Fremstad who underscored for Miss Cather the force of the artist's self-discipline. Because her work was all that interested her, the singer maintained that

"to know how to work is the most valuable thing in the world, and there are very few people indeed who know what real work is." Like all her artists, fanciful and real, Miss Cather herself was unsparing in the acquisition of craftsmanship. Only through flawless technique, she believed, could the gift of expression be fully and supremely enunciated. Work thus demands a great price but it offers a great reward.

As the artist recognizes the power within him, and as he disciplines and channels this power, he achieves his growth, which is both aesthetic and moral, "a refining of the sense of truthfulness" from within. This growth does not come easily, for the acquisition of truth is not easy. As Miss Cather says in *The Song of the Lark*, "The stupid believe that to be truthful is easy; only the artist, the great artist, knows how difficult it is." Despite difficulty of attainment, truth constitutes the only real justification for the art. When the truth of art is achieved, there comes what Miss Cather in her story "Namesake" (*McClure's*, March 1907) calls a "feeling of union with some great force, of purpose and security, of being glad that we have lived." Generally introspective and even egocentric, the artist becomes absorbed at his triumphant moment into a supernal creative force which supersedes all egotism and all individualism. Through the act of projecting the self in a search for the "impersonality" of ultimate truth, the artist arrives at personal happiness.

These experiences of exaltation, durable in memory but infrequent in occurrence, are attained only after struggle and suffering. The rarity of visionary moments has made philosophically inevitable the perpetual striving which precedes the flashes of illumination. Struggle is inseparable from the conception and fruition of art. But the artist's struggle is more than a philosophical one. It begins with his birth; because he is driven by an unquenchable desire for expression, and because all normal human relationships and ordinary virtues become subordinate to his desire, the artist is ostracized and made to suffer. Writing of Olive Fremstad, Miss Cather said:

> Circumstances have never helped [her]. She grew up in a new, crude country where there was neither artistic stimulus nor discriminating taste. She was poor, and always had to earn her own living and pay for her music lessons out of her earnings. She fought her own way toward the intellectual centers of the world.

Even after the world recognizes the greatness of an artist, the struggle continues. When Madame Fremstad reached the great art centres and her genius was appreciated, the cities themselves were "to be in a manner, her antagonist, the scene of her fiercest struggle and greatest

conquests." Similarly, Cressida Garnet, the successful artist in "The Diamond Mine," had for twenty years "been plunged in struggle; fighting for her life at first, then for a beginning, for growth, and at last for eminence and perfection; fighting in the dark, and afterward in the light. . . ." The struggle becomes in time habitual, inextricably related to the artist's work, his personality, his life, and even his death. In the face of the dead Sculptor, thus, Willa Cather detects that there was none of the "repose we expect to find in the faces of the dead. . . . It was as though the strain of life had been so sharp and bitter that death could not at once relax the tension and smooth the countenance into perfect peace—as though he were still guarding something precious which might even yet be wrested from him."

Even suffering, nevertheless, has its compensation, and most notable for the artist is his occasional power to wrest a victory from adversity and to realize the gloriousness of the quest. Writing in "Three American Singers," Miss Cather remembered that

> Wagner once said that the bigger the bell, the more difficult it is to release its tone: a sleigh-bell will tinkle to the tap of a finger-nail, but to ring a great bell one must strike it with a hammer. . . . Goethe said: "There are many kinds of garlands; some of them may be easily gathered on a morning's walk." There are others that are unattainable—that no one has ever gathered, and no one ever will. But the pursuit of them is one of the most glorious forms of human activity.

Paradoxically, the suffering depicted in art is transformed into a source of delight for the beholder, even as tragic drama conveys pleasure through the delineation of pain. To be able to transform one's own suffering into joy for another is a godlike gift. Miss Cather had no doubt that the artist so endowed belongs at the apex of a spiritual hierarchy. And she believed (as she said in *The Professor's House*) that art and religion, the same thing in the end, "have given man the only happiness he has ever had." Although she was orthodox enough in her own religious views, she paid special homage to the private individual spirit that she regarded as the unique heritage of all creative people, whether they be artists or priests or pioneers.

III

Although she granted the artist his spiritual eminence, Miss Cather had no illusions about his human failings. She recognized that frequently he is an incomplete individual and socially maladjusted. And yet his

limitations, she believed, are essentials of artistic development and progress, the negative traits making the fulfilment of the positive all the more desirable. Moreover, Miss Cather argued, all artists possess certain characteristics which are almost professional trademarks. When in "A Death in the Desert" she speaks of the "madness" of the artist, she ironically turns the popular misconception against society. She understood that the artist is by necessity a nonconformist who cannot yield to arbitrary social pressures and conventions, and that in self-justification society frequently regards the artist as mad. But what, Miss Cather wanted to know, are the characteristics of the artist's personality that cause him to be branded as a deviationist and iconoclast? Analysis of the composite artist led her to conclude that he is egotistic, socially amoral, totally lacking in caution, and overwhelmingly but impersonally generous. These traits, she added, are forged by the artist's voluntary social withdrawal, his indifferent rational intelligence, and the meagreness of his personal life.

Common to all artists, according to Miss Cather in the article "Three American Singers," is "an absence of caution; they are not afraid to say today what may be quoted against them tomorrow." This trait perhaps more than any other sets the artist apart from the social world, which Miss Cather saw timorously dedicated to security. Fearful of social reproach, the average individual exhausts himself in evasions "to propitiate the tongue of gossip." In the prosperous small towns of early twentieth-century America, for example, "people's speech, like their voices, their very glances, became furtive and repressed. Every individual taste, every natural appetite, was bridled by caution." Barren of purpose and productivity, Miss Cather writes in *My Ántonia*, such empty lives deposited nothing but "the growing piles of ashes and cinders in the back yards." But timidity of this order extends far beyond the small town, permeating the entire social structure of the country. Thus the artist in "A Gold Slipper," confronting a prosperous business man, could say accusingly:

> You are . . . oh, so cautious! You are naturally afraid of everything new, just as I naturally want to try everything: new people, new religions—new miseries, even. . . . But you, my friend, would be afraid to try a new shaving soap. It isn't gravitation that holds the world in place; it's the lazy obese cowardice of the people in it.

Miss Cather early formed an intensive, continuing antipathy towards the philosophy of caution. Even when she stood upon the platform of the Red Cloud, Nebraska, high school on June 5, 1890, to deliver her commencement address, she asserted: "[I]t is the most sacred right of

man to investigate; we paid dearly for it in Eden; we have been shedding our heart's blood for it ever since. It is ours; we have bought it with a price." Precocious, even arrogant, in the moment of their utterance, these words were to become the centre of a mature aesthetic philosophy.

Whether in philosophical speculation or in action, the artist's only recourse to the doctrine of caution is instant rejection. Timidity is incompatible with the struggle which leads to artistic achievement; the search for truth is nullified by the fear to investigate. In short, the artist's lack of caution is basic and vital to his art. Thea Kronborg expresses her courage and her scorn of cautious compromise in her love of the Grieg song, "Tak for Ditt Rad":

> Thanks for your advice! But I prefer to steer my boat into the din of roaring breakers. Even if the journey is my last, I may find what I have never found before. Onward must I go, for I yearn for the wild sea. I long to fight my way through the angry waves, and to see how far, and how long I can make them carry me.

Having such a long road to travel and such talent to fulfil, Miss Cather's artist has neither energy nor time for caution.

Despite the mutual antagonism, or at least indifference, between society and the artist, the artist is generously inclined towards all individuals. The paradox is one which Miss Cather makes no attempt to evaluate; she merely accepts the situation, as she illustrates in "A Death in the Desert." The dying artist, separated from the world, her family, even from the small clique who once appreciated her, never loses her ability to give to others. The generosity is mirrored in her eyes, "which possessed a warm, life-giving quality like the sunlight: generous, fearless eyes, which glowed with sympathy and good cheer for all living things, a sort of perpetual *salutat* to the world. . . ." Although the artist is indeed impersonal and aloof, he has a capacity for generosity because of his sympathy for human drabness, littleness, and suffering. If Miss Cather does not analyse the paradox, her artists frequently demonstrate it. They can momentarily alleviate human boredom or torment by crystallizing an ideal of life, and by setting before the timid and the cautious the beauty of artistic endeavour and hope.

Thus Dr. Archie in *The Song of the Lark*, meditating upon his small accomplishments and disappointments, realized that his existence had meaning only when it impinged on that of Thea. From association with her he acquired some of her exultance and was spared for brief instances the stultifying tedium of his life. Memories of the ordinary events of his life seemed faded and dispirited. Memories of Thea, however, "always

seemed humorous, gay, with a little thrill of anticipation and mystery about them." Why these memories of Thea should differ from others, Dr. Archie was not quite sure, except that "nearer than anything else they corresponded to what he had hoped to find in the world, and had not found." In the midst of his random reflection he suddenly understood Thea's great gift to him, for she alone symbolized those things "which in some way met our original want; the desire which formed in us in early youth, undirected, and of its own accord." To this giving of Thea's Dr. Archie became indebted for any meaning in his life.

Association with many artists, especially Geraldine Farrar, confirmed Miss Cather's belief that generosity is a conscious yet demanding gift. Frightened by the toll which Miss Farrar's artistic liberality exacted, Miss Cather hoped that Miss Farrar would "train up a duller self to serve her for dull purposes." Yet she also knew the singer "would rather live ten years thick than twenty thin." As Miss Farrar is quoted in "Three American Singers": "Why should I want to string it out twenty, thirty years? . . . I want to give it out all in a lump. I want to go hard while I'm at it!" So also is generosity the dominant characteristic of the artist Kitty Ayrshire in "Scandal." Unsparing of her vitality, she dedicates her talent to mankind. Like Geraldine Farrar, she

> wouldn't live on any terms but the very generous ones she had always known. She wasn't going to hoard her vitality. It must be there when she wanted it, be ready for any strain she chose to put upon it, let her play fast and loose with it; and then, if necessary, she would be ill for a while and pay the piper. But be systematically prudent and parsimonious she would not.

Generosity and lack of caution are innately and inextricably united. Without the one the other is impossible.

What amounts to the self-annihilation of his private life is the artist's indisputable proof of liberality. This destruction he willingly accomplishes by releasing all of his talent and energy and, in the process, ignoring the self. Because art is infinite, its development long and arduous, and life short, the artist must virtually deny himself the luxury of private intimacies and pleasures. The artist comes to see that he can justify his existence only in the wholehearted translation of his genius. The artist who realizes the meagreness of his social life accepts his condition as an inevitable one. When Thea Kronborg is asked about her non-professional life, she answers that she has none, that her work is a substitute. She goes on to describe devotion to art as a kind of gigantic web from which you cannot pull away "because all your little tendrils are woven into the picture." Artistic labour "takes you up, and uses you, and

spins you out; and that is your life. Not much else can happen to you." Willa Cather herself sees the life of one who has succeeded in yielding himself completely to his art as a kind of *Picture of Dorian Gray* in reverse. Discussing Thea's problem in her preface to *The Song of the Lark*, Miss Cather approves that her artistic, public life should become "more interesting to her than her own life." Thea's

> artistic life is the only one in which she is happy, or free, or even very real. It is the reverse of Wilde's story; the harassed, susceptible human creature comes and goes, subject to colds, brokers, dressmakers, managers. But the free creature, who retains her youth and beauty and warm imagination, is kept shut up in the closet, along with the scores and wigs.

Seen through Miss Cather's eye, the nature of the artist enforces an implicit pathetic irony; for as the imaginative life becomes richer the private life becomes more impoverished.

Egotism and indifferent intelligence are further tokens of the inconsistency of the creative disposition. Almost priest-like in his office, the artist can surrender his gift only after profound, introspective searching, for his calling is a lonely one. But less ideally, he is jealous of his isolation; he needs to insulate himself against exterior complexities and inferior demands. In no terms, however, may the contradiction be reduced to simple formulae; and Miss Cather herself, both in her art and life, illustrates her perplexity. Thea Kronborg, thus, engrossed in the progress of her career, refuses to come home to see her dying mother. Miss Cather does not condone Thea's conduct, even though in "A Death in the Desert" she insists "there is a sacred and dignified selfishness which properly belongs to art and religion." Exposed to similar circumstances, Miss Cather acted in a manner directly contrary to Thea's. While working on the manuscript of *Shadows on the Rock*, she learned that her mother, in California, had suffered a paralytic stroke. She went to her mother at once and stayed with her for extensive periods of time. And yet, despite her reaction to a personal situation, Miss Cather maintains an attitude of sympathetic objectivity towards Thea's conduct. In the abstract, at least, she believed the artist must allow nothing to impede his development. Miss Cather hints that it is unjust to accuse of selfishness the person whose life is an epitome of impersonality. Thea, indeed, might have found her position less trying had she followed the course conventionally dictated as "a daughter's duty to her mother." Miss Cather sees no easy answer, but consistently within her writings she advises the suspension of all judgments on the artist's personal and moral life. An Aristotelian for this immediate purpose, she accepts the

premiss that "virtue is concerned with action; art with production." The standards of behaviour expected of the patriot, the philanthropist, and the statesman are not applicable to the artist. She can forgive in the artist vanity, selfishness, hyper-sensitivity, indecision on the grounds that "with a great gift . . . we must be willing to bear greatly, because it has already greatly borne."

Miss Cather, in a narrow generality that is credible only as long as it is limited to her own characterizations, concedes that a superior rational intelligence is not a necessary part of the artist's natural endowments. Learning she believes plays no large part in the artist's life, and he has no concern with philosophical or analytical abstractions. "A child's normal attitude toward the world is that of the artist, pure and simple. The rest of us have to do with the solids of this world, whereas only their form and color" exist for the artist. To most of her artists, moreover, the grasp of an idea comes slowly and even with difficulty. Characteristically, Thea Kronborg struggled to understand an intellectual concept. And as her teacher said, the effort was arduous, for "in spite of being so talented, she's not quick." The artist himself is generally aware of his intellectual limitations and, indeed, is somewhat ashamed of them. For example, Cressida Garnet in "The Diamond Mine" has a great musical talent but a mind "somewhat mismated with it." Because she is sensitive to her deficiency, she has "the depressing knowledge of what a wretched faulty thing any productive faculty is."

IV

As viewed by Miss Cather, the artist is essentially a tragic figure. Voluntarily dedicated to his life of struggle, he can hope for only rare acknowledgment from a world characterized in "The Sculptor's Funeral" as "a desert of newness and ugliness and sordidness." Nothing can be more destructive to the soul and mind and latent desire, Miss Cather implies, than to have constant effort meet with equally constant uninterest. From the very beginning then, she says in "A Death in the Desert," the artist is faced with "the tragedy of effort and failure, the thing Keats called hell." And since the artist gives himself over completely to his art—physically, emotionally, and intellectually—his hell is an all-encompassing one. Destroying his own life in his desire to create beauty for a world which has no real wish to receive it, the artist seldom achieves personal happiness. Miss Cather is forced to wonder, in "A Death in the Desert," "whether all the gift-bearers, all

the sons of genius, broke what they touched and blighted what they caressed thus!" The ruined, living body of Maggie in the same short story becomes Miss Cather's personification of the artist's self-immolation. Even the titles of these stories—"The Sculptor's Funeral" and "A Death in the Desert"—suggest the self-destructive element both physically and spiritually.

Much of the artist's tragedy derives from the mutual suspicion which exists between himself and society. The artist in his dealings with the social world goes through various degrees of hostility. Early in his career he realizes that there is a wide chasm which separates the artistic individual from the community. Miss Cather herself made this discovery while she was yet a college undergraduate; and she was sufficiently brash to ignore the pain inherent in this situation.

> The further the world advances the more it becomes evident that an author's only safe course is to cling to the skirts of his art, forsaking all others, and keep unto her as long as they two shall live. An artist should not be vexed by human hobbies or human follies: he should be able to lift himself into the clear firmament of creation where the world is not. He should be among men but not of them, in the world but not of the world. Other men may think and believe and argue, but he must create.

For Miss Cather and her fictional artists this youthful bravado was in time to grow until it became an open declaration against the world of mediocrity. The realization came to Thea Kronborg that all these things and people constituting middle-class society "were no longer remote and negligible; they had to be met, they were lined up against her, they were there to take something from her." Determined that they should never destroy her desire for achievement, she vowed: "They might trample her to death, but they should never have it. As long as she lived that ecstasy was going to be hers. She would live for it, work for it, die for it; but she was going to have it, time after time, height after height."

This avowed hostility between the artist and society is further described by Miss Cather in "A Death in the Desert" as a "long warfare" which is so futile and enervating that it can only distract the artist's attention from his singular purpose. Thus, in this same story Miss Cather has her artist conclude that only through withdrawal—complete and voluntary—may self-preservation be achieved.

> The footlights had seemed a hard, glittering line drawn sharply between their life and hers, a circle of flame set about those splendid children of genius. . . . That sixth sense, the passion for perfect expression, and the

lustre of her achievement were like a rosy mist veiling her such as the goddesses of the elder days wrapped about themselves when they vanished from the arms of men.

Yet the fictional artists of Willa Cather did not retreat from the world any more completely than did she herself. Often accused of being a recluse or an artistic snob, she was unremitting in her withdrawal. Difficult though the situation was for her, she felt that it was her only opportunity "to preserve the integrity of her life as an artist, its necessary detachment and freedom." Withdrawal meant a resolute exercise of her will against that of the public. As her friend Miss Lewis says, "it was not disdain for the tributes people wished to pay her, or a feeling of superiority or indifference, that caused her to withdraw more and more from the world. It was self-preservation."

Willa Cather, to be sure, responded more generously than most of her artists to obligations imposed on her by ties of friendship and family. But she confined these loyalties rigorously and very nearly achieved the detachment that she idealized in her artists of fact and fancy. She likewise, whenever she could, refined almost out of existence the world of material affairs and substituted the intangible values of perfection. Her literary success and her tranquillity were won with perhaps less struggle than those of most artists; and one consequently is not readily inclined to condone her hostility to a society which gratefully accepted her talents. Similarly, she may be questioned for the sometimes dangerously generalized, always unproportioned, view of the artist's social needs and commitments. The fact, however, is that she believed in these principles devoutly. She would have acceded to Eliot's premiss, that "the more perfect the artist, the more completely separate in him will be the man who suffers and the mind which creates." Though it is not easy to sympathize with the plea for isolation or to agree that the suffering of the artist is of a variety superior to that of the non-artist, Miss Cather cannot fail to win respect for her consistently, aesthetically realized devotion to an ideal.

NOTES

1 "Three American Singers," in *McClure's*, XLII (Dec. 1913). All Miss Cather's references to Olive Fremstad are taken from this article. The singer herself served as the model for Thea in *The Song of the Lark*.

2 "Training for the Ballet," in *McClure's*, XLI (Oct. 1913).

A PARIS THEATRE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

John Lough

Since 1680, when Louis XIV ordered the amalgamation of the two existing French companies of actors, the Comédie Française had been *the* Paris theatre. Until the Revolution it enjoyed a monopoly of the performance of those plays, inherited from the previous century, which it still considered worth performing, and, save for most of the comedies of Marivaux, almost all new plays of any value were first produced on its stage. It was to the Comédie Française that a serious theatre-goer would make his way—for the greater part of the century to the theatre on the Left Bank, in what is now known as the Rue de l'Ancienne Comédie; then, when these premises became unusable in 1770, to the Tuileries Palace; and finally, from 1782 to the Revolution, to the new building, opposite the Luxembourg Gardens, which, although twice ravaged by fire, still stands, bearing the name of the Théâtre de l'Odéon, or, more accurately, that of Comédie Française, Salle Luxembourg.

Unlike his counterpart in the Paris of our day, an eighteenth-century theatre-goer did not take his pleasures between 9 P.M. and midnight. It was in the early evening—generally at 5, but sometimes as late as 6 o'clock—that the curtain rose in Paris theatres. This was preceded by dinner, formerly taken at midday but by 1789 served as late as 3 P.M., at least in the polite society of the capital; supper followed the return from the theatre about 9 P.M.

When a would-be spectator had fought his way through the mud and smells of the narrow streets of eighteenth-century Paris, or had arrived more comfortably in his carriage, he entered the candle-lit theatre. Where one sat (or stood) depended on one's sex as well as one's purse. For a woman the choice was severely restricted, as some parts of the theatre were strictly reserved for men. In the 1760's a writer pointed out that no woman could gain admission to the Comédie Française without paying 30 *sous*—and that for a seat where she could scarcely hear or even

less see the actors. Female spectators had to choose among the three rows of boxes which were, of course, also available to men. The first row of boxes, which could be hired either as a whole or in single seats, were among the most expensive parts of the theatre and were generally occupied by ladies of the aristocracy.

For men there was a wider choice. They might accompany ladies to the boxes, but if they came to the theatre on their own or with male companions, they might well decide to go to one of two other parts of the theatre which it is difficult for the playgoer of today to visualize—the *parterre* (or pit) and the stage itself.

Only when it moved to its new theatre in 1782 did the Comédie Française at last provide seats for the spectators in the pit; in doing so it more than doubled the price. Until that date the *parterre*, always the preserve of male spectators, had offered a relatively inexpensive form of entertainment, although to remain standing, often in a dense crowd, for hours on end cannot have been very comfortable, and as the floor was not inclined, the view of the stage was often poor, especially when a small spectator found himself squashed behind a tall one. None the less this all-male section of the audience played an important part in the life of an eighteenth-century theatre, as it had done in the age of Molière and Racine, since the spectators in this part of the house generally formed a good half of the total audience. Sometimes they were a mere handful, when the play was bad, or the weather too hot or too cold, or there was competition from outside, whether from another theatre or from some form of public spectacle. But during the first run of a popular play or the successful revival of an old one as many as six or seven hundred men could be squeezed together in this part of the theatre. Their applause or their catcalls could have a decisive influence on the sort of reception accorded to the play. So firmly rooted was the tradition of having spectators standing in the pit that when, shortly before the Revolution, seats were at last provided, the change was by no means universally welcomed, and not only because of the steep rise in price.

Even further removed from modern ideas of how a theatre should be run was a custom which appears to have grown up by the middle of the seventeenth century in the different Paris theatres and which was not abolished at the Comédie Française until 1759: on each side of the stage there sat or stood male spectators. It must not be imagined that their numbers were necessarily small, at any rate on an evening when a reasonably popular play was being given. If the registers of the Comédie Française for the eighteenth century do not distinguish between tickets for the

stage and those for the first row of boxes, which were the dearest parts of the house, we can get an idea of the number of spectators who might clutter up the stage by looking back to the registers at the beginning of the theatre's history. We find, for instance, that at the very first performance given by the company after its foundation in 1680 no fewer than 150 tickets for the stage were sold, and figures of 100 or more seem to have been quite common whenever a play attracted a large audience.

The effect which the presence of spectators on the stage had on theatrical illusion is obvious: it was simply shattered. When a popular play drew a large crowd onto the stage, the actors got mixed up with the spectators, who in any case were not always models of good behaviour, as this part of the theatre was the favourite haunt of the young bloods of the town. Shortly before the custom was finally abolished, the actor Lekain drew up a memorandum for his colleagues in which he asked:

> Ne nous paraît-il, à nous-mêmes, de la dernière absurdité de voir figurer sur notre théâtre les pères de la Grèce et de Rome avec nos jeunes colonels, nos élégants sénateurs, nos opulents financiers, et leurs plus riches intendants? Sera-ce une loi toujours sacrée parmi nos vétérans, que le danger de Joas, sur son trône, excite des éclats de rire indécents, quand les ministres du Très-Haut, confondus avec les soldats d'Athalie et nos élégants français, se battent tous ensemble, les uns pour enlever un dépôt si précieux, les autres pour le sauver?[1]

The presence of these spectators on the stage sometimes gave rise to grotesque incidents. At the first performance of a new tragedy in 1736 the appearance of an actor, bearing a packet of letters and pushing his way through the crowd of spectators, produced a shout from the pit, "Place au facteur!" which rather ruined the atmosphere of the play. An even better-known incident of this kind occurred a dozen years later, at the first performance of Voltaire's tragedy *Sémiramis*. The actor who played the part of the ghost being unable to force his way onto the stage, one of the guards entrusted with the maintenance of order destroyed the effect of the most melodramatic moment in the play by shouting, "Messieurs, place à l'ombre, s'il vous plaît!"

A contemporary account of the contrast between the state of affairs before and after the abolition of seats on the stage in 1759 is given in the journal of Charles Collé for that year:

> L'illusion théâtrale est actuellement entière; on ne voit plus César prêt à dépoudrer un fat assis sur le premier rang du théâtre, et Mithridate expirer au milieu de tous gens de notre connaissance; l'ombre de Ninus heurter et coudoyer un fermier général, et Camille tomber morte dans la coulisse sur

Marivaux et sur Saint-Foix qui s'avancent ou se reculent pour se prêter à l'assassinat de cette Romaine par la main d'Horace, son frère, qui fait rejaillir son sang sur ces deux auteurs comiques.[2]

The disappearance of spectators from the stage was undoubtedly the most important technical change which took place at the Comédie Française in the course of the eighteenth century. Now that the stage was no longer thus encumbered, appeal could be made to the eyes of the audience by the use of spectacle and crowd scenes; the dramatists of the time, beginning with Voltaire, were quick to exploit the change, as we shall see.

To the same period of the century belongs another innovation in the seating arrangements of the theatre: actors began to hire out boxes either for life or, more commonly, by the year. From modest beginnings in the 1750's the boxes hired by the year (they were known as *petites loges*) came gradually, by the end of the 1770's, to furnish something like a third of the takings of the theatre in an average year. In the new theatre, taken over in 1782, there were over 500 of them, as against 1,400 seats hired by the performance. The playwrights of the time were particularly aggrieved by this development as, in calculating what payments should be made to authors of new plays during their first run, the actors counted in very considerably less than they actually received from these seats, and so reduced still further the amount of money which a new play brought its author. For ordinary spectators, at least when the theatre was drawing large crowds, the difficulty of finding a seat was increased, especially as more and more space in the theatre was taken up by *petites loges*.

What sort of people frequented the Comédie Française in the eighteenth century? The great majority of spectators belonged without a doubt to the upper and middle ranks of society. The lackeys who earn a mention in Molière's *Critique de l'Ecole des femmes* had been forbidden to attend the Paris theatres, "même en payant," by a royal decree issued at the beginning of the century. Until about 1760 or 1770 plebeian spectators do not seem to have made an appearance at the Comédie Française except on the comparatively rare occasions when the actors offered a free performance to celebrate such events as a royal marriage or birth. On such days a completely different audience invaded the theatre. When, for instance, in 1721 the actors gave a free performance to celebrate the recovery of the young Louis XV from an illness, half the seats in the Comédie Française had been filled by midday, and before two the theatre was crammed. "On avait observé dès le commencement,"

according to a contemporary account of the occasion,[3] "de laisser entrer aux loges, au théâtre et à l'amphithéâtre[4] les femmes, les enfants et les hommes âgés et incommodés, renvoyant au parterre les jeunes gens et le bas peuple." Somewhat to the surprise of the writer, the performance passed off "sans la moindre contestation ni le moindre accident, et ce qu'il y a de particulier, c'est que cette populace assemblée fut non seulement attentive pendant toute la représentation, mais encore elle applaudit très juste et très sensément aux meilleurs endroits de la pièce."

Not all contemporary observers agreed that the taste of a plebeian audience of this kind was so refined, but they do agree that such plebeian spectators were altogether exceptional. Thus in 1768 we find Voltaire writing to Horace Walpole: "Le bas peuple d'Athènes entrait au spectacle, et il n'y entre pas chez nous, excepté qu'on lui donne un spectacle gratis, dans des occasions solennelles ou ridicules."[5] The German critic, Grimm, made the same point when he wrote, three years earlier, "Ce n'est point le peuple qui fréquente chez nous les spectacles; c'est une coterie particulière de gens du monde, de gens d'art et de lettres, de personnes des deux sexes à qui leur rang ou leur fortune a permis de cultiver leur esprit: c'est l'élite de la nation à laquelle se joint un très petit nombre de gens qui tiennent au peuple par leur état ou par leur profession."[6] A similar impression is conveyed by Louis-Sébastien Mercier when, in his revolutionary work *Du Théâtre, ou Nouvel Essai sur l'art dramatique* (1773), he put forward the shocking plea that the *peuple* should be admitted to the theatre and that playwrights, instead of writing only for a small *élite*—for "une compagnie particulière à laquelle ils ont eu le dessein de plaire exclusivement"[7]—should attempt to produce works which would be understood and appreciated by the masses. In attacking such heretical views, La Harpe agrees with Mercier that the masses are excluded from the serious theatre of the day; he, however, considers this both inevitable and a positive good. "Pourquoi donc," he asks, "veut-il absolument que nos tragédies soient pour le peuple, répète-t-il sans cesse ce mot de peuple, nous reproche-t-il amèrement de ne pas travailler pour le peuple, de mépriser le peuple?" The answer he gives to Mercier is brutally simple: "Est-ce le peuple qui vient à nos spectacles? Il n'en a ni le temps, ni le moyen."[8]

Yet in the last two decades of the *ancien régime* various writers do begin to remark upon a change in the composition of the audience in the *parterre*. In 1774, for instance, the Swiss critic, Meister, commenting on the decline in the taste of this section of the audience, which traditionally exercised a considerable influence on the fate of new plays, declares:

Le parterre était composé, il y a quinze ans, de l'honnête bourgeoisie et des hommes de lettres, tous gens ayant fait leurs études, ayant des connaissances plus ou moins étendues, mais en ayant enfin. Le luxe les a tous fait monter aux secondes loges, qui ne jugent point, ou dont le jugement, au moins, reste sans influence; c'est le parterre seul qui décide du sort d'une pièce. Aujourd'hui cet aréopage est composé de journaliers, de garçons perruquiers, de marmitons; qu'attendre de pareils sujets? et peut-on se méprendre à la cause des disparates de leurs jugements?[9]

Other writers, in the 1770's and 1780's, complain that more plebeian spectators, whose presence changed the character of the audience, were infiltrating from the more popular theatres of the Boulevards into the Comédie Française. La Harpe, who earlier had agreed with Mercier that the plebs did not frequent theatres like the Comédie Française and the Théâtre Italien, complained in 1783 that a change had taken place:

Nos spectacles ne sont plus ce qu'ils ont été, une assemblée choisie d'amateurs et d'hommes plus ou moins instruits; c'est le rendez-vous d'une foule désœuvrée et ignorante depuis que le peuple des petits spectacles n'a eu besoin, pour envahir les grands, que de payer un peu plus cher un plaisir dont on lui a donné le goût et qui n'était pas fait pour lui.[10]

Despite evidence of this kind, it still remains doubtful whether, if one bought a ticket to the cheapest part of the theatre, one ran much risk, even in the last decade or two of the *ancien régime*, of encountering many plebeian spectators. The chief interest of observations of this kind is that they furnish clear proof that for the greater part of the eighteenth century even the *parterre* of the Comédie Française was frequented by a solidly bourgeois audience, which might well include even a sprinkling of noblemen. A spectator who chose to go to that part of the house might expect to rub shoulders with merchants and lawyers, writers and schoolmasters, students and schoolboys. The established playwright, it is true, no doubt took advantage of one of his "perks"—the privilege of free admission to the theatre—to sit in a box or even on the stage; but there is plenty of evidence to show that writers did not disdain to frequent the *parterre*. In 1759 Diderot wrote to his mistress Sophie Volland, "J'irai ce soir à la comédie nouvelle. . . . Je serai dans le parterre, vers le fond et dans le milieu; c'est de là que mes yeux vous chercheront."[11] In the following year, at the first performance of Voltaire's *L'Ecossaise,* a counterblast to Palissot's *Philosophes* in which Diderot and his friends had been lampooned, he appears to have led the Encyclopaedist troops in the *parterre* of the Comédie Française in the battle for the success of Voltaire's play.[12]

During the first run of a new play the *parterre* was often the scene of

such battles between the supporters and the enemies of the author. Indeed a playwright often organized his supporters in a *claque* and provided them with free tickets to the theatre. There are some lurid stories about Voltaire's efforts to secure the success of his tragedies in his duel with the elder Crébillon. More credible is the account of the battle for the success of his tragedy *Sémiramis* in 1748, which we find in the memoirs of his secretary. This gives us some idea of the stirring scenes which one could witness in the pit of the Comédie Française if one were present at a first night. In addition to the free tickets to which he was entitled, Voltaire bought, his secretary tells us, a considerable number of tickets to the *parterre* and distributed them among his friends, who in turn passed them on to their acquaintances:

> J'en eus pour ma part des billets à distribuer, et je les mis en de bonnes mains, c'est-à-dire capables de bien claquer et à propos. Il fallait sans doute être armés et prêts à la défense contre des agresseurs connus et nombreux. Le jour de la représentation arrivé, les champions de part et d'autre ne manquèrent pas de se trouver sur le champ de bataille, armés de pied en cap; j'y tenais de pied ferme mon rang de fantassin. Chaque parti se promettait bien la victoire; aussi fut-elle disputée et la lutte pénible. Dès la première scène des mouvements excités dans le parterre, des brouhahas, des murmures se manifestèrent; on crut même entendre quelques coups de sifflet obscurs et honteux; mais dès le commencement aussi les applaudissements balancèrent au moins tous ces bruits, et ils finirent par les étouffer. La pièce se soutint, la représentation se termina très bien, et le succès ne parut point équivoque.[13]

At least one adventurer of the time managed to turn the organization of a *claque* into a remunerative occupation by using it for purposes of blackmail: unless the author of a new play paid up, the 150 hirelings who formed the *claque* would be turned against his play, and it would be whistled off the stage. It is several times alleged in memoirs of the time that playwrights paid out more to buy tickets for their supporters than they received from the actors in royalties. The poet Dorat is made to lament in an epigram of the 1770's:

> Des petits vers pour Iris, pour Climène,
> Dans les boudoirs m'avaient fait quelque nom.
> Désir me prit de briller sur la scène;
> Mais j'y parus sans l'aveu d'Apollon.
> Là comme ailleurs s'achète la victoire.
> A beaux deniers l'on m'a vendu la gloire.
> Mieux eût valu, ma foi, qu'on m'eût berné.
> Que m'ont servi tant de prôneurs à gages?
> De mes succès où sont les avantages?
> Un seul encore, et je suis ruiné.

Against this background one sees more clearly the point of a famous passage in *Le Barbier de Séville* in which Figaro relates to the Count his misadventures as a playwright:

> FIGARO: . . . En vérité, je ne sais comment je n'eus pas le plus grand succès, car j'avais rempli le parterre des plus excellents travailleurs; des mains . . . comme des battoirs; j'avais interdit les gants, les cannes, tout ce qui ne produit que des applaudissements sourds; et d'honneur, avant la pièce, le café m'avait paru dans les meilleures dispositions pour moi. Mais les efforts de la cabale. . . .
>
> LE COMTE: Ah! la cabale! monsieur l'auteur tombé!
>
> FIGARO: Tout comme un autre: pourquoi pas? Ils m'ont sifflé; mais si jamais je puis les rassembler. . . .[14]

After reading this passage, it is amusing to reflect that various contemporaries accused Beaumarchais of packing the theatre with his supporters in order to secure the success of his own plays!

However, although things could be lively on a first night, they never seem to have been quite as rowdy at the Comédie Française in the eighteenth century as they had sometimes been in Paris theatres in the previous age. Twice during the last few months of his life, when he was at the very height of his fame both as actor and as playwright, Molière had his theatre invaded by rowdies who interrupted the whole proceedings. On one occasion stones were thrown at the actors and a spectator in the pit was beaten up and seriously wounded; while Molière himself was on the stage, "il fut jeté du parterre le gros bout d'une pipe à fumer sur le théâtre."[15]

Disturbances were not unknown in the Comédie Française in our period, but acts of violence do not seem to have been committed. Whether this was because of increased refinement of manners or because of the precautions taken by the authorities to preserve order, it is difficult to decide. The authorities certainly took no chances. In his *Tableau de Paris* Mercier tells us how order was maintained at the Comédie Française by a company of thirty armed guards. The spectacle which greeted theatre-goers when they arrived at the Comédie Française must have been an impressive one:

> En arrivant devant une salle de spectacle, vous apercevez une compagnie de gardes, fusil sur l'épaule.
>
> Crispin et Arlequin ne paraissent jamais sur les planches que préalablement des grenadiers, avec leur haut bonnet, n'aient occupé l'enceinte du théâtre où vont paraître les ris et les jeux. Ces soldats . . . font à quatre heures des évolutions militaires sur la place, comme s'ils allaient à l'ennemi. On les voit distinctement mettre la balle dans le fusil: voilà le prélude de la comédie. Cela n'est pas trop gai avant une représentation du *Bourgeois gentilhomme*.

Nor were the functions of these soldiers inside the theatre purely decorative:

> En dedans le fuselier vous range comme des oignons, vous fait asseoir, interpelle l'auditeur ventru, le chicane, veut que telle banquette contienne autant de derrières, sans en avoir pris les proportions; il impose silence à ceux qui crient qu'ils étouffent. Il faut écouter le bon Molière sous la moustache d'un grenadier. Riez ou sanglotez trop, le grenadier qui ne rit point, qui ne pleure point, observe à quel degré monte votre expansive sensibilité.
>
> Un major, peu civil et mal coiffé, de sèche figure, beaucoup plus ami des comédiens qu'il connaît que du parterre qui s'écoule, se courrouce quand on siffle ses amis. Il n'a qu'à faire un geste, et l'homme de goût, que le mauvais révolte, est soudain enlevé entre les deux hémistiches d'un vers cornélien. . . .
>
> Le major examine jusqu'à quel point le siffleur qui paye a manqué de respect au comédien et à l'auteur. Quand il a bien pesé le délit de lèse-comédie, alors il envoie en prison le criminel.[16]

Mercier proceeds to contrast in this respect the theatres of Paris with those of London which he had known at first hand and where no such strong-arm methods were considered necessary to preserve order. His own views on this subject are somewhat mixed. On the one hand he admits that Paris theatre-goers need to be kept in order and that only by such methods can one be sure of enjoying a play in peace: "Il faut sacrifier ici une portion de sa liberté pour jouir plus sûrement de l'autre." On the other hand he applauds the more liberal attitude of the authorities who were gradually giving the audience more freedom to express their opinions openly, indeed robustly, and he concludes: "Il faudrait lui abandonner pleinement et politiquement le droit d'approuver ou d'improuver à haute voix tel auteur et tel comédien."

So far we have considered what sort of spectator might be encountered in the pit of the Comédie Française in our period; but, especially in view of the profoundly aristocratic society of France before the upheaval of 1789, we must not forget the place which the upper classes occupied in the theatre audiences of these years. Of the kings and queens of eighteenth-century France only Marie Antoinette can be said to have been a patron of the Paris theatres, including the Comédie Française. She was to make a last appearance there as late as the autumn of 1791, after the return from the ill-fated flight to Varennes. Other members of the royal family were, however, often to be seen there, together with the princes and princesses of the blood, who when they came to the theatre, had the right to occupy any box of the first row, even though it had already been let to some private individual; but, as long as there were seats on the stage, the princes preferred to sit there. "Les princes du sang vont le plus souvent se placer sur le théâtre," a contemporary informs us,

"et alors les acteurs suspendent la scène, tous les spectateurs se lèvent par respect, et les princes vont occuper la première place qui leur est cédée par celui qui y était assis."[17]

The high society of Paris undoubtedly played a prominent rôle in a theatre like the Comédie Française. In her *Nouveau Théâtre Anglais*, published in 1769, Mme Riccoboni contrasts the theatre audiences of London and Paris, declaring that whereas in Paris the aristocracy and the wealthy are assiduous theatre-goers, in London the audience is much more bourgeois and plebeian. When her old friend Garrick complained about these remarks, she held firm to her opinion, and what she says about Paris theatre audiences of the time is no doubt true: "Ici les premiers du royaume font leur séjour habituel du théâtre: les dames ont de petites loges à l'année, la comédie est le rendez-vous de la bonne compagnie. . . . Mille fainéants titrés n'ont d'autre ressource contre l'ennui que les chauffoirs des trois spectacles."[18]

The same impression of the importance of the upper-class spectators in the audiences of the Comédie Française in the eighteenth century emerges from the vivid description of a first night in a letter of Voltaire's:

> C'est un grand jour pour le beau monde oisif de Paris qu'une première représentation: les cabales battent le tambour; on se dispute les loges; les valets de chambre vont à midi remplir le théâtre.[19] La pièce est jugée avant qu'on l'ait vue. Femmes contre femmes, petits-maîtres contre petits-maîtres, sociétés contre sociétés; les cafés sont comblés de gens qui disputent; la foule est dans la rue en attendant qu'elle soit au parterre.[20]

The importance of aristocratic and wealthy spectators in the life of a theatre such as the Comédie Française is brought out in a recent study of the places in Paris at which the posters of the three leading theatres were displayed.[21] In 1753 not a single one of the 175 sets of posters was placed in the plebeian quarters of the city; nearly all were to be found in the old aristocratic quarters—the Marais and the region near the Louvre and Palais Royal—and the now rising aristocratic districts of the Faubourg Saint-Germain and the Faubourg Saint-Honoré.

If we imagine ourselves inside the Comédie Français at a performance of a play at any date down to 1789 (the Revolution did bring certain changes), we should find ourselves among spectators drawn in overwhelming majority from the middle and upper ranks of society. If we stood in the *parterre*, as did quite a number of foreign travellers, we should find ourselves squashed in a crowd of worthy bourgeois. If we took a seat in one of the boxes, especially the lower ones, we should find ourselves among the *beau monde* of eighteenth-century Paris—the noble-

men of the court, the judges and high officials, the tax-farmers and wealthy rentiers, and, of course, their womenfolk, always an important section of the audience. The composition of the audience inevitably reflected a society in which birth was still of tremendous importance.

One does not, however, go to the theatre merely to examine the audience, although that was notoriously one of the attractions of theatre-going in the eighteenth century. The male spectators inspected the pretty women, on and off the stage, and the ladies in their *petites loges* did not concentrate all their attention on the play. As Mercier put it in his *Tableau de Paris*:

> Il faut donc, quand on est femme, avoir dans une *petite loge* son épagneul, son coussin, sa chaufferette, mais surtout un petit fat à lorgnette, qui vous instruit de tout ce qui entre et de tout ce qui sort, et qui vous nomme les acteurs. Cependant la dame a dans son éventail une petite ouverture, où est enchâssé un verre, de sorte qu'elle voit sans être vue.[22]

If we imagine ourselves inside the Comédie Française in the eighteenth century, concentrating at any rate most of our attention on what was happening on the stage, one of the first things which would strike us would be the use of the curtain. From the moment it was raised at the beginning of the performance, it was not lowered again until the play was over; it was not used to separate the different acts of the play. The article "Théâtre" in the *Encyclopédie* declares that the curtain "se lève au commencement de la pièce et s'abaisse à la fin de la représentation." At least one writer of the time argued in favour of lowering the curtain at the end of each act, but the idea did not take on. In his first play, *Eugénie,* Beaumarchais had the idea of filling out by dumb show the intervals between the acts when the stage lay revealed to the eyes of the spectator. At the end of Act I he explains the idea in the following terms:

> L'action théâtrale ne reposant jamais, j'ai pensé qu'on pourrait essayer de lier un acte à celui qui le suit par une action pantomime qui soutiendrait, sans la fatiguer, l'attention des spectateurs, et indiquerait ce qui se passe derrière la scène pendant l'entr'acte. Je l'ai désignée entre chaque acte. Tout ce qui tend à donner de la vérité est précieux dans un drame sérieux, et l'illusion tient plus aux petites choses qu'aux grandes.

A *jeu d'entr'acte*, as he calls it, is to be found at the end of Acts I, II, III, and IV, and it is only at the end of Act V that we find the words "La toile tombe." Beaumarchais himself tells us that the actors of the Comédie Française did not dare to put this dumb show on the stage between the acts and in his later plays he did not repeat the experiment; but this attempted innovation does make it clear that in an eighteenth-

century Paris theatre the curtain was lowered only at the end of the performance and that from the beginning to the end of the play the stage and its setting lay exposed to the eyes of the spectators.[23]

When the curtain at last rose, what sort of setting, illuminated by the hundred or so wax candles which served as footlights, was revealed to the audience? This is not quite such an impossible question to answer as the question of how the actors and actresses of the period interpreted their parts and said their lines. Yet to attempt to give an idea of the stage settings and costumes which appeared before the eyes of eighteenth-century spectators is no easy task, owing to the paucity of documents. The evidence is not always easy to interpret. We can, for instance, study the stage directions of the plays of the period, but there was often a considerable gap between what the author asked for and what the actors provided, especially in the period before the spectators were removed from the stage. The reader of Voltaire's tragedy *Sémiramis*, first produced in 1748, gets the impression that the play was performed with considerable spectacular effects. It opens with the setting of "un vaste péristyle, au fond duquel est le palais de Sémiramis. Les jardins en terrasse sont élevés au-dessus du palais. Le temple des mages est à droite et un mausolée à gauche, orné d'obélisques." In Act III the scene changes to a room inside the palace, and for scene 6 the stage directions run:

> Le cabinet où était Sémiramis, fait place à un grand salon magnifiquement orné. Plusieurs officiers, avec les marques de leurs dignités, sont sur des gradins. Un trône est placé au milieu du salon. Les satrapes sont auprès du trône. Le grand prêtre entre avec des mages. . . . La reine est au milieu avec Azéma et ses femmes. Des gardes occupent le fond du salon.

In Act IV the action shifts to the vestibule of the temple and in Act V it goes back to the same setting as that for Act I. Yet all these elaborate and striking scene changes came to nothing when the play was first performed in 1748. All the actors provided was one stage setting, that indicated for the first act.

Even when, after the removal of the spectators from the stage in 1759, the author was given approximately the setting he wanted for his play, there is often no means of telling, even roughly, what it looked like in the theatre, as engravings and similar illustrations are extremely rare. However, the general trend of stage settings in the Comédie Française is clear: the actors gradually abandoned the simplicity of the previous age, exemplified by the conventional antechamber in a palace required for a classical tragedy, and went in for more striking and elaborate stage

settings, especially after the stage was freed from spectators. In the year after this reform Voltaire was able to make full use of the enlarged stage in his tragedy *Tancrède*, which is set in eleventh-century Sicily; he filled the space at his disposal with knights in armour and also offered a double setting, first in the hall of a palace, then in a square outside, with a wall on which were displayed shields, lances, and emblems. In his next tragedy, performed in 1764, he made even greater appeal to the eye. The action takes place before the temple of Diana at Ephesus; from time to time its doors open to reveal "deux longues files de prêtres et de prêtresses couronnées de fleurs [all were dressed in white robes with blue sashes] et une décoration magnifiquement illuminée au fond du sanctuaire." The most striking scene occurs in Act V when "le temple s'ouvre; on voit le bûcher enflammé," into the flames of which the heroine plunges after stabbing herself.

Voltaire remained fairly conservative in his use of more spectacular settings in tragedy, but the younger playwrights of the period after 1760 went further in this direction, especially now that tragedy no longer confined itself, as in the past, to treating subjects taken from ancient Greece and Rome, but took in all sorts of countries and historical periods. Thus a spectator who frequented the Comédie Française in 1766 could see a tragedy on William Tell, set against a background of a lake with high rocks from which the tyrant Gessler came tumbling down when pierced by the hero's arrow. In the following year he could enjoy the exotic setting provided by another tragedy, entitled *Hirza ou les Illinois*, which depicted North America in the seventeenth century, complete with Niagara Falls and scalps. This is the setting which the author provided:

> On voit dans l'enfoncement le Saut de Niagara. D'un côté des rochers, des cabanes et quelques arbres; de l'autre un tombeau élevé sur des piliers matachés, et décorés de chevelures en forme de trophée; au pied du tombeau est un autel sur lequel sont les armes du défunt, ses flèches, son casse-tête et son manitou.

In 1770 another playwright exploited the Hindu suttee in a tragedy entitled *La Veuve de Malabar*. In Act V the setting changes and the spectators had brought before their eyes "le parvis de la pagode des Bramines, entouré de rochers; un bûcher est dressé au milieu de la place; on voit au loin la mer." When the play was first put on, the funeral pyre, according to La Harpe, was represented merely by a small hole from which issued a few tiny flames. When it was revived ten years yater, with great success, the spectators got more for their money: this time

there was "un vaste bûcher, très exhaussé et très enflammé, la veuve y montant au milieu des feux, et un bel acteur l'enlevant avec des bras d'Hercule, du milieu des flammes qui allaient la dévorer."[24]

This was far removed from the simple setting and absence of physical action in the tragedies of Racine. The same trend is also visible in the comedy of the closing decades of the eighteenth century; it is perhaps best illustrated in the comedies of Beaumarchais, particularly in *Le Mariage de Figaro* where spectators were offered a separate setting, generally described by the author in considerable detail, for each of the five acts. There was a similar movement in all the different dramatic *genres* towards greater realism in costume. In his essay *De la poésie dramatique*, in which he argued in favour of the new *genre* of the *drame*, Diderot demanded that theatrical costumes should be simple and true to life, and in both his comedies and his *drames* Beaumarchais devoted considerable attention to presenting accurate costumes. In his first play, *Eugénie*, set in contemporary England, he gives a detailed account of what he calls the "habillement des personnages, suivant le costume de l'état de chacun en Angleterre," while for *Le Barbier* and *Le Mariage* he is careful to indicate that "les habits des acteurs doivent être dans l'ancien costume espagnol."

It was, however, in tragedy that spectators began to be offered, after the middle of century, the most striking changes in costume. Hitherto the actors had continued to wear the most conventional costumes when portraying heroes of Greek and Roman history or legend. It is true that some vague attempt at local colour might occasionally be made for tragedies dealing with, say, an Oriental theme; thus in Racine's Turkish tragedy *Bajazet* the actors wore long robes and turbans, at least as early as the 1740's and possibly from the very first performance of the play in 1672. Yet the disregard for vulgar details of historical accuracy in the costuming of tragedy shown by the actors early in the eighteenth century is illustrated by Voltaire's famous observations on Corneille's tragedy *Polyeucte*, the action of which is laid in the Roman Empire in the third century A.D. On Act IV, scene 3, where the martyr-hero kneels in prayer, Voltaire comments: "Je me souviens qu'autrefois l'acteur qui jouait Polyeucte, avec des gants blancs et un grand chapeau, ôtait ses gants et son chapeau pour faire sa prière à Dieu." On the last scene in the play, in which, after the death of Polyeucte, Sévère comes to upbraid Félix for sending him to his execution, Voltaire offers the additional comment: "Autrefois, quand les acteurs représentaient les Romains avec le chapeau et une cravate, Sévère arrivait le chapeau sur la tête, et Félix écoutait chapeau bas: ce qui faisait un effet ridicule."[25]

These remarks were written in the 1760's when, partly under the influence of Voltaire, attempts were already being made at the Comédie Française, particularly by Lekain and Mlle Clairon, to achieve greater historical accuracy in costume. When Voltaire's tragedy *L'Orphelin de la Chine* was given its first run in 1755, the spectators were offered not only a Chinese palace as the setting for the play, but also actors in Chinese costumes (or what passed for Chinese costumes in 1755). The actresses, including Mlle Clairon, appeared with bare arms and even discarded the hoop-petticoats which they had hitherto worn in tragedies.

However, it is clear that the reforms in costume introduced by Lekain and Mlle Clairon at the Comédie Française in the 1750's and 1760's did not go very far. It was left to the great actor Talma, at the end of our period, to make really radical changes towards historical accuracy in costume. It was in 1787 that he made his *début* at the Comédie Française. Two years later he created a sensation when, partly under the influence of the painter David, he was bold enough to appear in a minor part in Voltaire's tragedy *Brutus* dressed in a Roman toga, with bare arms and legs.

With Talma, however, we are already entering a new age with its ideal of strict historical accuracy in theatre costumes and settings. We cannot pursue the history of the Comédie Française through the troubled period of the Revolution. Our aim has been to give some notion of the atmosphere in which the succession of great actors and actresses who graced the Comédie Française in the eighteenth century first brought to life the tragedies of Voltaire, the *drames* of Diderot and Sedaine, and, above all, since they are the sole survivors on the stage today of all the vast output of plays in that century, the comedies of Marivaux and Beaumarchais.

NOTES

1 Lekain, *Mémoires* (Paris, 1801), 48.

2 Charles Collé, *Journal et mémoires*, ed. H. Bonhomme (Paris, 1868), II, 172.

3 *Mercure* (August 1721), 102–3.

4 Rows of seats behind the *parterre*.

5 Voltaire, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. L. Moland (Paris, 1877–85), XLVI, 82.

6 Frédéric-Melchior de Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire*, ed. M. Tourneux (Paris, 1877–82), VI, 171.

7 Louis-Sébastien Mercier, *Du théâtre*, v.

8 Jean-François de La Harpe, *Œuvres* (Paris, 1778), I, 175–6.

9 Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire*, X, 340–1.

10 Jean-François de La Harpe, *Correspondance littéraire* (Paris, 1801–7), IV, 75.

11 Diderot, *Correspondance*, ed. G. Roth (Paris, 1955—), II, 146.

12 Bibliothèque Nationale, MS.fr. 22191, f. 272.

13 *Mémoires sur Voltaire et sur ses ouvrages par Longchamp et Wagnière, ses secrétaires* (Paris, 1826), II, 210–11.

14 *Le Barbier de Séville*, Act I, scene 2.

15 E. Campardon, ed., *Documents inédits sur J. B. P. Molière* (Paris, 1871), 31–9.

16 Louis-Sébastien Mercier, *Tableau de Paris* (Amsterdam, 1783–9), VI, 121–2.

17 L. Riccoboni, *Réflexions historiques et critiques sur les différents théâtres de l'Europe* (Paris, 1738), 137.

18 I.e., the foyers of the Comédie Française, Théâtre Italien, and Opéra. See David Garrick, *Private Correspondence* (London, 1831–2), II, 561.

19 In order to reserve seats on the stage for their masters (this was in 1752).

20 Voltaire, *Correspondence*, ed. T. Besterman (Geneva, 1953—), XX, 235.

21 F. de Dainville, "Les Lieux d'affichage des comédiens à Paris en 1753," *Revue d'histoire du théâtre* (1951).

22 Mercier, *Tableau*, II, 188.

23 See G. Védier, *Origine et évolution de la dramaturgie néo-classique* (Paris, 1955).

24 Jean-François de La Harpe, *Lycée ou Cours de littérature* (Paris, 1834), II, 270.

25 Voltaire, *Œuvres complètes*, XXXI, 404, 416.

Quebec Today

F. C. A. Jeanneret
Jean-Marc Léger
Pierre Harvey
Arthur Maheux
Gérard Bergeron
Gérard Dion
Jean-Charles Bonenfant
Charles Bilodeau

CONTRIBUTORS

F. C. A. JEANNERET
Professor and Head of the Department of French, University College, University of Toronto, and Principal of the College

JEAN-MARC LÉGER
Member of the staff of *Le Devoir*, Montreal, and general secretary of the Union Canadienne des Journalistes de Langue Française

PIERRE HARVEY
Professor of Economics in the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales de Montréal

ARTHUR MAHEUX
Archivist, Laval University; author of *Propos sur l'éducation, Nos Débuts sous le régime anglais, French Canada and Britain: A New Interpretation*, etc.

GÉRARD BERGERON
Professor of Political Science, Laval University; author of *Problèmes politiques du Québec* (1958)

GÉRARD DION
Professor and Director of the Department of Industrial Relations, Laval University; author of *Sécurité syndicale et morale* (1947) and *Le Syndicalisme obligatoire devant la morale* (1957)

JEAN-CHARLES BONENFANT
Chief Librarian, Library of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec; author of *Institutions politiques canadiennes* (1954) and *Thomas Chapais* (1957)

CHARLES BILODEAU
Director of Research, Department of Education, Quebec, and Professor at the School of Education, Laval University

[The following Supplement does not pretend to do more than introduce its readers to some of the opinions current in Quebec today. The articles ought to promote discussion both in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada and it may be possible at a later date, if the interest aroused warrants it, to publish further articles illustrating other tendencies in French-Canadian thought which have not found expression in these pages.

The articles, which, with the exception of the Abbé Arthur Maheux's, were written in French, have been translated by members of the Department of French, University College, University of Toronto. EDITOR.]

INTRODUCTION • *F. C. A. Jeanneret*

This symposium on "Quebec Today" will correct many popular misconceptions. The French Canadian will turn out to be a much more complex character than hitherto imagined, and *un pays où rien ne change* will no longer be accepted as an accurate description of his province.

In the cultural domain Ancients and Moderns are still at odds in Quebec as elsewhere, and the balance is fairly even; but a totally new phenomenon has recently emerged in the economic world, and here the New is rapidly outstripping the Old. Urbanization and industrialization have advanced at a very much faster pace than in any other part of Canada—in 1890, 37 per cent of the population lived in the towns and cities of Quebec, in 1951 more than 70 per cent—and this rapid transformation has resulted in widespread social restlessness. So, while the greatly reduced rural population still clings loyally to everything the Old Order stands for, to the much more numerous urban section new horizons are becoming increasingly attractive, especially when seeming to offer brighter social and economic prospects.

The immediate phase of this rapidly evolving society is the subject of study of seven French-Canadian authorities, each interpreting his own field of specialization for the benefit of English-Canadian readers. The topics treated are of real significance and represent much that is distinctive, without any pretence, however, of giving a complete picture. If the aim were more encyclopaedic, much would properly be included by way of historical background, analysis, and evaluation of the French heritage and of individual achievement in the arts, professions, business, and industry. What the Editor requested from the authors of his choice was that each "article should treat the subject critically and should be addressed to an academic intellectual audience." The series was intended to represent no one school of thought, least of all that of the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, and the introduction called for from an outsider was merely to provide a brief explanatory setting. If any contributor

lays himself open to the suspicion of partisanship, this must be ascribed to his failure to regard the dispassionate objectivity of the Anglo-Saxon as a cardinal virtue.

In the field of politics, thinking is a much more independent and highly individualized process in Quebec than anywhere else in Canada. A Torontonian could readily define nationalism to his own satisfaction in a sentence of not more than ten words. To such a Canadian, whose political creed is as often determined by instinct as by logic, Jean-Marc Léger's masterly exposition of this particular doctrine in its French-Canadian setting and application, with its infinite variety of concepts and total irreconcilability of factious disciples, will prove singularly revealing, and perhaps somewhat challenging to his mental faculties.

Each succeeding article will disclose unsuspected qualities in Jean-Baptiste and his *milieu*. While the authors take pride in some of his virtues and accomplishments, they are not unwilling to admit shortcomings and errors. Nor do they fail to indicate where English Canadians have fallen short in appreciation or co-operation. Perhaps the most novel, as well as the most completely documented, study in the series is that entitled "French Canadians and Democracy." Acceptance of the argument of Abbé Maheux might account for much that French Canadians find to criticize in their own electoral practices, though little palliative is left to their English-speaking compatriots for the incredible proceedings last June 10 in the St. Paul's constituency in Toronto. In any case, this article will serve to illustrate the dominant rôle that religion plays in every phase of the French Canadian's way of life. His every project, his individual and social planning, his political and economic thinking are all motivated and determined throughout by his religion.

Yet even in the spiritual domain there is evidence of some change of attitude. While there is little likelihood of any serious anticlerical sentiment making much headway in French Canada in the foreseeable future, the growing social restlessness already referred to is reflected also in the establishment of numerous youth groups with various shades of political and religious affiliations, each with its own journalistic organ and enjoying varying degress of ecclesiastical approval. All this reveals not so much a lessening of clerical influence as a growing realization on the part of the laity of its responsibility as an active partner in the discussion of religious as well as political and social questions. Additional evidence of the growth of this co-operative spirit, clerically inspired in this instance, is found in the leadership now being given by members of the higher clergy in the gradual revolution in social outlook and even in the formation of

Roman Catholic labour syndicates or unions. Abbé Dion's study of the "Trade-union Movement in Quebec" illustrates this sympathetic interest and insight and shows the trend towards wider union affiliations of what were originally almost entirely company organizations.

This analysis by highly qualified interpreters of an important section of Canada, anxious to maintain its identity, should remove some of the misunderstandings and deep-seated prejudices that have proved so divisive a factor in our national structure. Some rent will surely have been made in the invisible but real curtain that has separated us for two hundred years into *Two Solitudes*. Certainly, intelligent understanding is the one prerequisite to, and is indeed synonymous with, ***bonne entente***, and this sympathetic understanding between our two cultural groups, different in ethnic origin, in tradition, and in religion, and with equally distinctive political and social aspirations, can be arrived at only through the unceasing efforts of men of good will who respect each other's convictions, rights, ideals, and objectives.

ASPECTS OF FRENCH-CANADIAN NATIONALISM

Jean-Marc Léger

Nationalism in the present-day world has fared badly at the hands of the press, at least in the Western world. Countless are the theorists who have voiced their unreserved condemnation of it, and their judgment is repeated in the most varied modes by a large section of the press which sees in nationalism a harmful attitude and an "outworn" mode of behaviour. However, these very people, whom I shall call in a general term liberals, are paradoxically enough the staunchest supporters of the young Asian and African nationalisms whose aspirations to independence they automatically approve, and whose refusal to compromise they excuse with indulgent benevolence.

They explain their seemingly contradictory attitude by maintaining that this nationalism functions at two different levels. While being worthy of admiration in young states in gestation as an expression of a legitimate will to escape domination and "exploitation" from outside and to enjoy their being to the full, it calls for reproof in states long since independent as an exhibition of racialism and a more or less confessed aspiration to hegemony, in short as a factor of totalitarianism within the state and of imperialism without. This is an attractive explanation in theory but fails to encompass the infinitely complex reality of political life. As a matter of fact, this effort at a justification *a posteriori* of a contradictory attitude is another sign of the confusion that reigns in the present day, when high-minded sentiments leave an ever slenderer margin to healthy ideas.

In French Canada this same phenomenon, this same condemnation of nationalism, is naturally to be found in a large fraction of the young intellectual *élite*. Here the contradiction is flagrant and the confusion all the greater since French Canada from several points of view occupies the very situation which would "justify" Asian and African nationalism. What exactly is being thus condemned? And what do those people defend who, rising against this denunciation, claim to be partisans of nationalism? One can reasonably meet these questions only with an analysis of

the evolution and prevailing state of French-Canadian nationalism, today at the height of a crisis.

However, before coming to the heart of the problem it is important to stress that we in North America are generally the victims (in nationalism as in many other matters) of an inclination to transfer to our home ground the ideological quarrels of Europe, and when confronted with such-and-such a doctrine or concept to take up our stance in positions which various European schools of thought have adopted, and to use arguments which cannot apply to our own situation. This is striking in our case among those who never cease to criticize nationalism: as often as not they adopt the very terms used in the condemnations uttered in Europe. The justifiable repulsion brought about by the fascist and Nazi adventures and their aftermath has a good deal to do with it. Nationalism has emerged both as the basis of neo-militarism, pitiless racialism, and the will to dominate and as the sign of a social conservatism which takes on the complexion of either paternalism or domineering corporatism. So by reason of the dress it had assumed at a certain time in certain countries, nationalism in every form was condemned. With a like indignation, what Malraux termed "la droite virile"—a fascist style—and "la droite épaisse"—in the style of the paternalist bourgeoisie—were also denounced. Strangely enough, nationalism was being unhesitatingly identified with the right wing at a time when in several parts of the world (for example, in Indonesia, Indochina, and more recently in the Middle East) it was taking up its position on the left. On the other hand, it must be said that the majority of nationalists were laying themselves strangely open to this identification, and wantonly helping in the confusion. One clerico-conservative train of thought (in no way connected with the true French-Canadian nationalist tradition) had made Franco into a "Father of the Church," warmly passed on the most fragmentary pronouncement of Marshal Pétain, and found it difficult to hide a tendency to sympathize with the fascism of Mussolini. In fact, and this is one of the major causes of the prevailing confusion, this entire question was thrown out of perspective by supporters everywhere defining their stand in terms of a notion of nationalism—European and contemporary—which had few or no points of contact with French-Canadian nationalism.

I

It would be wrong of us to trace very far back the existence of French-Canadian nationalism in the currently accepted meaning of the expression. It is only recently that those here at home who champion nationalism

have begun to search their thoughts, and far from attempting to define a doctrine, have tried to put their ideas in order, pinpoint their aims, prescribe courses of action in certain situations, suggest lines of conduct, and give a lead. It must be said that although we have had "national thinkers," particularly historians, other intellectuals spurred to action, and politicians, at various times but principally since the turn of the century, we have never yet had any theorists of nationalism. This is no doubt a deficiency, but it is also in a sense a healthy sign. Here already recognizable is one of the characteristics of a minority people, constantly on the defensive, throughout its history forced to improvize counter-strokes, and scarcely finding time to ponder on the meaning and the requirements of its situation.

Littré defines nationalism in this way: "A preference, at times exclusive, for all that relates to the nation on which one depends." Rather than a definition, this is a summary description, which betrays that pejorative connotation which today besmirches nationalism. We are not on the right track here if we wish to discover the precise nature of what is termed in a special sense, perhaps for lack of a better expression, French-Canadian nationalism. This was and still is to a large extent, a simple healthy reflex, a spontaneous automatic reaction of an individual or group naturally striving for survival. In this sense our "nationalism" appeared with the Conquest.

Like all peoples, especially weak peoples, who stand in need of a "golden legend," of a heroic past, we have been led to idealize the conduct of our forbears after 1760, and to describe as an almost unanimous determination to "survive as a nation" what was at best a kind of passive resistance. Moreover, this determination was based more on a normal attachment to a type of civilization, a way of life, a language, customs, and a religion believed in danger, more on an instinctive shrinking from that which was foreign, than on a clear consciousness of what was needed to preserve the French spirit. What is surprising about this after all? The Conquest took place at a time when a sense of nationhood, as we know it today, existed not at all. Nationalism was not to rise up in Europe for half a century. For these populations, moulded to a long tradition of absolute monarchy, the right of peoples to forge their own destinies was not even conceivable. The result was that when the people of New France went on shouting "Long live the King," it was simply George III instead of Louis XV. No traces of indignation or even of any real fear as to their future as a nation are to be noted in our ancestors following the Cession. What is in fact to be found is a mixture of stupor, confusion, and anxiety

about their own economic future as individuals and about their religion. It was in fact this religious concern which was to be the far off starting-point of an attitude of resistance that timidly foreshadowed nationalism in so far as the steps taken for the preservation of the Faith were to have a salutary effect on the language and on a form of civilization.

Another factor was to have a powerful effect: isolation. By ousting the French Canadians from the conduct of affairs in less than a quarter of a century, the newcomers helped to give the "conquered" the spirit of a common cause. And if a fraction of the upper and middle classes came to terms with the conqueror, the masses were going to withdraw into their shells, and enter upon passive resistance. They had, however, nothing of the docile herd about them, cringingly loyal to the nobles and the clergy, as one is too often inclined to think.

The invasion by the insurgents from the Thirteen Colonies in 1774 was to demonstrate this. Most ordinary people showed their sympathy for the Bostoners, as they were then called, and a quite considerable number gave them active support. While the priesthood (reassured by the provisions of the Quebec Act concerning the exercise of religion and their own status) and the upper class took up the cudgels for Great Britain, the humbler folk greeted the new ideas warmly. Veritable mutinies broke out in a number of places, noblemen were struck, threats were used against priests. Later, in 1790, Mgr Hubert, Bishop of Quebec, declared that he was apprehensive "of the progress which the spirit of liberty and independence has made among our Canadians."

We know today that if the whole population had passed over into the American camp, it would have meant the extinction of French Canada within a short time, and we also see that the Quebec Act formed a sort of judicial basis for French-Canadian nationality and gave recognition to the distinctive character of our group. The important thing to remember, however, about the rupture between the classes at the time the militiamen crossed from the Thirteen Colonies, is the basically popular character of the still confused determination to seek freedom. In this is to be seen a constant which reappears again and again at every step of our national life.

The American Revolution was to have a decisive influence on the destiny of French Canada. On the constitutional level, it was to bring about Britain's granting in turn of the Quebec Act and the "Constitutional Act" of 1791. In the social sphere, it was to put an end to the influence of the upper class and was to rob them forever of the people's esteem, thus hastening a decline already in evidence. Lastly, in the realm

of ideas, it was to spark off certain aspirations, give free rein to their expression, and stimulate the assertion of a sense of nationality, the first real manifestation of which is seen at the end of the eighteenth century.

It is in fact with the implementation of the Act of 1791 and the emergence of parliamentarianism that two basic changes took place. The first was the almost complete elimination of the upper class from the public scene, this coinciding with their impoverishment, and the arrival on the scene of the first French-Canadian politicians—barristers, notaries, doctors—for the most part of humble origin. The second was the change from passive resistance, from a simple "existence" to a self-awareness as a distinct element. The introduction of French Canadians to parliamentarianism coincided with the great flare-up of liberalism in Europe. The younger generation here was influenced by it. This was the generation which a few years hence would enter the Assembly. However, little or none of the struggle took place on nationalist grounds but on that of popular liberties and respect for parliamentary prerogatives. Here in Lower Canada, where indeed they form the overwhelming majority, the French Canadians (or simply the *Canadiens*, as they called themselves or were called by others) in fact commanded respect for their language, and had not to be continually reminding themselves of their position as beings apart and in a minority, as they had to do later.

In point of fact, the very attitude of the conqueror was such as to hasten a new and passionate assertion of a driving sense of nationhood. The violation of parliamentary prerogatives, pro-English preference in the distribution of all public posts, and the scorn shown by the English administration were to awaken self-awareness as opposed to passivity. It is really from the 1830's that we must date the origins of French-Canadian nationalism understood as a militant attitude in the quest for justice in the interests of the ethnic group.

II

A page was turned in 1834 when the more forthright political elements of the French-Canadian people adopted among the ninety-two resolutions the following text (number fifty-two):

> The majority of the country's inhabitants are in no way prepared to repudiate any of the advantages which they enjoy thanks to their origin and to their having descended from the French nation, which, in the light of contributions she has made to the progress of civilisation, science, literature and the arts, has never fallen behind the British nation, and which today in the cause of liberty and of the science of Government, is its worthy rival. . . .

In view of the character of the popular rally at which this text was adopted (the Assembly of the Six Counties, a truly national rendezvous), the taking of such a stand marked a milestone and began a new phase. It is from this collective assertion of self-respect, this lucid self-definition as heir to a great civilization, that French-Canadian nationalism dates.

The events that followed are well known: the insurrection of 1837–8 and its consequences. Not the least of these was the Act of Union, but this event itself, owing to the fact that it would soon put the French Canadians in a minority in the country and in Parliament, would serve the development of nationalism. Had it been introduced half a century sooner, the union might well have compromised French-Canadian survival. By 1841, however, French Canadians had undergone their apprenticeship in parliamentarianism, they had a number of good leaders, and above all they found themselves caught up in circumstances which were to stimulate their sense of nationhood. The transformation was such that it was no longer conceivable that French-Canadian politicians should wish for the gradual blending of the French element with the British, as had been their wish between 1780 and 1790.

It is in this period too that the establishment of a fresh point of contact between liberal and national ideas can be detected. Here we must go back a little. I recalled earlier that at the time the American insurgents streamed into Canada, a clean break was witnessed between the Canadian population and those traditionally at the head of its affairs, the latter defending the cause of established power, the former not hiding its sympathy for the invaders. In the same way, though, it is true, in quite a different context, between 1837 and 1838 the high clergy and what remained of the upper class were to be seen either working in common accord with authority or, more often, without approving of the official attitude, openly condemning recourse to arms. This revolt, high-minded in its inspiration but pitiful in its carrying out, was in essence a popular phenomenon, and if for those in power it had been purely a matter of defending a certain conception of liberalism and parliamentary democracy, it seems obvious that the impromptu soldiers of the Richelieu or Deux-Montagnes regions meant simply to fight with "the Englishman," in defence of cultural values which they vaguely thought were being threatened.

Now in the period 1850–70, and especially after the return to the scene of Louis-Joseph Papineau, a new and for the first time intellectual wave of leftist nationalism can be discerned, with all the reservations one may make concerning the implications of the term. It is indeed strik-

ing to see that the most cogent elements of the ideas put forward by the intellectual youth of the time are to be found in a certain number of features, the main being the cult of liberalism in all its forms, a more penetrating grasp of cultural values, and a determination to defend the means of expression open to their culture. At the same time there is to be seen a foreshadowing of the crisis we are going through today, a clean break between two schools of thought both claiming to maintain things French in Canada. One school, the most powerful (the affair of "les Castors," the moves made to establish Catholic parties, and so on being its most eloquent signs), considered that in Canada, the French and Catholic causes were permanently bound up, that the first supported the second and found its justification almost in the latter, and that the union could not be dissolved without the risk of sacrificing both. This mode of thought, carrying in embryo the whole range of conservative thought with which our life as a nation has to this day remained remarkably stamped, almost reached the stage where it would defend the French cause only because this seemed to be the essential vehicle of the Catholic faith. Hence the reticence shown in the face of all things emerging from post-revolutionary France, and the urge to defend the French cause almost as a private preserve. The other tendency, long illustrated by a certain type of liberalism, considered on the contrary that the connection between the French and Catholic elements had been a historical coincidence upon which we have sometimes been happy to congratulate ourselves, but that it was a danger for both these orders of values to persist in associating them together. This school of thought would not hear of being cut off from contemporary French culture, and refused the species of theocracy into which the first-mentioned school could well lead us.

So it is from this time on that friction between two types of thought can be seen building up, and this, after a dormant period, has burst forth again in the last ten years or so, and has even brought things to breaking point. It is no longer possible to talk of "the French-Canadian nationalist school." We must deal in terms of several schools, so greatly do their ideas vary.

It was with Confederation that the first signs of virulent political nationalism were to be seen, nationalism here being understood as a systematic pursuance of preservation and expansion. Three dates stand out in the history of this expansion: 1885, the Riel affair; 1910–18, the struggle against participation in the wars of the Empire; and 1935–45,

the re-emergence in the main of the same grievances. To this one must add the struggles in the schools, begun one after the other in most of the English-Canadian provinces but especially in Ontario and in the West, which were to help spread the voice of French-Canadian nationalism. When one stops to examine this period, one is struck by four main phenomena. (1) Various attempts were made to boost nationalist aspirations in the realm of active politics. These attempts took shape in the adventure of the political parties, which by taking advantage of economic crises or world wars momentarily captured the attention of an attentive public among the French-Canadian population but which eventually failed on account of their improvised character, their internal splits, and the inadequacy of their programmes. (2) Coinciding with a fruitful effort to rediscover the history of French Canada, an upsurge of pride among youth between 1900 and 1940 found militant expression in the countless associations voicing nationalist leanings. (3) Nationalism exercised an attraction on the intellectuals as a whole, strengthened by the ideals of the new French right wing (Action Française, etc.) with which a number of our intellectuals were imbued, who indeed were often more closely attuned to French political dissensions than they were to the events taking place in their own country. (4) Perhaps the most important fact is that nationalism, having long been the more or less confused expression of the will to survive and of the hostility of the masses to authority (except at certain times: conscription, the crises of the thirties), no longer found an echo among the people, and became in a manner the preserve of the middle classes.

Especially from the First World War onwards was this transformation to be perceptible. It was a good thing in a way, for its effect was to disquiet most of the young intellectuals and the youth entering the professions, who later in one sphere or another would be at the head of affairs. But it was to be regretted in that it bade fair to make nationalism into a thing of form and sentiment, to define it as a mass of positively indispensable claims in which insufficient account would be taken of the economico-social revolution Canada was silently but rapidly undergoing. To be sure there were men to be found among the nationalists of this generation who had a social ideal, but they remained a minority and their attitude stemmed too often from paternalism. For those who had undertaken to make French-Canadian nationalism a doctrine, the economic and social problems were not really felt in all their acuity, or if they were, the response made to them was that dictated by a refusal to

recognize evolution—witness the campaigns for the return to the land, or the chimerical efforts at colonization in the Abitibi and other regions. For the most part the young pioneers of this effort at revitalization of Canada, brought up in the conservative atmosphere of our colleges, imbued with a highly orthodox liberalism in economic and social matters, marshalled their ideas solely in the light of traditional criteria. There were not many among them who could see that the defining of an economic policy on a large scale would be more profitable in the long run than obtaining bank-notes printed in both languages or a high percentage of French-Canadian civil servants in key posts. Their pride had need of these outward signs, and their enthusiasm ill fitted them for the long wait which the monumental efforts at even partially reconquering our economy would bring about. In such a stringent situation, the policy of "home-buying" was not what was needed to provide a solution, but it at least had the merit of drawing attention to the ever increasing gravity of our economic subservience.

We must, at all events, remember in this generation's favour that it had succeeded in making nationalism an ideological current that was to be permanent and at times virulent, a matter which various political parties would in differing measure be bound to bear in mind. In addition, it had fostered attempts at analysing the evolution of French Canada, which doubtless fell short, but which in certain respects were of great value. This 1920–40 period also saw the appearance of a series of works, brochures, and newspapers which helped maintain a certain vigilance among those of our persuasion, and made progress in cultural and social fields of which we are enjoying the fruits today. It is not unsymptomatic that most French Canadians who today occupy key posts in higher education, trade unions, federal administration, and high banking circles were active at one time or another in nationalist associations, shared the general trend of thought (in the absence of a doctrine still not formulated), and though they may have since left it somewhat far behind them, owe to the experience gained in this way much useful material for reflection.

III

If, with our twenty years of perspective, we look closely at the panorama of French-Canadian nationalism, we may observe in men as in tendencies a transformation of such proportions that it has spared not a single group among us, and that has meant an effort at analysis and at facing facts of which we may expect much.

To talk these days of French-Canadian nationalism is at best to allude to a very general movement subscribed to by those who are particularly preoccupied with the future of French Canada, men for whom the survival of the ethnic group as a distinct entity is the predominant anxiety. Beyond this there are to be found only differing conceptions concerning the future of French Canada, and differing proposals as to the means to be employed in making it a reality.

What is actually happening? Since the end of the war, the re-establishment of contacts with Europe, especially with France, the increase here at home of writings which criticize nationalism, further still the fact that most of the young French-Canadian intellectuals have spent some time in Europe, all these factors have brought about anxious questioning, and subsequently the refusal of a large number to carry on work in a direction which they consider harmful, or at least sterile.

The end of world conflict shifted emphasis from more properly political problems to economic and social problems. On the one hand, the failure of the "Bloc populaire Canadien" (which made the mistake among others of identifying political nationalism with the temporary problems raised by our participation in the war) brought with it a degree of disaffection towards the traditional spokesmen of nationalism. On the other hand, through economic expansion and industrial development in which Quebec figured with the rest of the country, youth became aware of economico-social realities, the upward trend of trade-unionism and the essential rôle played by economic factors in our society. It was all at once realized that nationalism, at least in the form in which it had been known and in which it had been supposedly practised, had offered no workable solution to these problems, and soon it was to be found that many of the leaders hitherto applauded were, when confronted with fresh problems, singularly conservative. (Let us however recall at this point, that on the crest of the post-war nationalist wave, a group had appeared, "les Jeunes Canada," among whom a "social" tendency, new to French Canada, had gained ground. The principal figures who backed this tendency are today in the forefront of liberal and progressive nationalism, or, as some people maintain, "left-wing nationalism.")

The stage was being reached when all the traditional attitudes were being revised, from the opinions expressed about France's Third Republic, Vichy, and Francoism to the hasty condemnation of nationalism in all its forms and indulgence towards French-Canadian capitalism. No longer were people willing automatically to espouse a cause, spontaneously to accept a point of view merely because it was being defended by

French Canadians. No longer would they accept the specious national pseudo-union which worked to the advantage of those in power. Above all it was being discovered that French Canada was first and foremost an economico-social reality, and that the budding claims of French-Canadian workers could not be met merely by sentimental appeals. Gradually a shift of emphasis took place. A new conception of nationalism was being elaborated at the very time when its spokesmen were showing understandable indignation at being termed nationalists, and were denouncing nationalism. Instead of first seeking to impose on our Anglo-Canadian partners an outward respect for the kind of civilization we represent, the primary aim was to provide the French-Canadian masses, by bettering their material well-being, with the means of realizing their potential as human beings, with the opportunities for turning their minds to things cultural which in our intensely conservative society had remained the prerogative of a few. With the rejection of what was called the "*a priori* reasoning" of the traditionalist school, it was not sought to give at the start a defence and elucidation of the French and Catholic causes, but rather to inquire into the human reality of our society, the problems it has in common with the rest of the country and continent, and the problems which are peculiar to it. Before defending a heritage, it was sought to establish the reality of this heritage.

At the same time, and thereby revealing the liberal element which has always been the soul of authentic French-Canadian nationalism, this new tendency was no longer prepared to accept the exclusivism voiced by the traditionalist school towards everything connected with leftist ideologies and all the intellectual production of contemporary France. In addition there was a refusal to identify the religious cause with the national cause, the argument being that each suffered anyway from the mortgage imposed on it by the other. We should notice that in this reaction there was often an element of injustice, in that the criticism of individual men and attitudes was too often and too inconsequentially applied to a group *en bloc* to which a number of those who scorn its members today owe in goodly measure their social preoccupations and a disquiet that has its reward.

IV

From the heart of this French-Canadian society there were arising three phenomena, which may in the future be of supreme importance to nationalism.

First it is important to take note of what one might call the "silence of youth." Youth, and particularly student youth, had once been the leading wing of nationalism in French Canada, as it was yesterday in most Western countries, and as it is today in Afro-Asian countries. What, then, has happened in the last few years? Doubtless there are still youthful claimants to the name of nationalist, whose actions tend to confirm their leanings. But the masses are inert. It is true that the dangers are different: they are more insidious, giving less cause for noisy demonstrations. Let us not say that youth has lost interest, but rather that it is waiting. It is silent because it is no longer sure which road to take; it lacks confidence when faced with the grave problem of making a choice among a hierarchy of allegiances, among the solutions proposed. Youth is waiting for something and someone: it is waiting for a synthesis, a coherent doctrine from those who are called "social nationalists."

The second new phenomenon is the Union Nationale. Two decades of power have singularly discredited the nationalist pretensions of this party. This political adventure has done some service to authentic nationalism, and yet at the same time has done it harm. The harm lies in the base exploitation on the electoral platform of certain fundamental aspirations, of certain essential claims, of the French-Canadian people. The service it has done is to purge the ranks of nationalist sympathizers of a lower middle-class conservative element, and simplify nationalism's effort at reorientation.

The third, final, but by no means least important, phenomenon is the way in which the Church has retreated. Until recent years, the most dynamic element of the French-Canadian clergy was unflinchingly nationalist, in the manner of the time, with a deal of ardour, ostentation, sincerity, if not always lucidity. This was true in particular of the members of the clergy engaged in education, to whom all secondary teaching in Quebec is entrusted. It was largely to them that we owed the rise of successive generations of young French Canadians, finding their life's work in the professions, who were militantly and often virulently nationalist. In other respects, this situation strengthened the notion of interdependence of the language and the Faith, of the French aspect and the Catholic aspect of Canada. It also helped keep French-Canadian nationalism in a rather heavy-going orthodoxy and a sterile conservatism. This state of affairs has undergone considerable changes in the last twelve years or so. The new generations of younger clergy and members of the religious orders are marked by the tendency to be more reflective and hesitant which we have found in youth as a whole. The more lively

among the younger clergy are interested rather in social action and things of the spirit than in strictly "national" problems. But in this way, too, nationalism feels liberated from a heavy burden which was hampering its transformation, and which had been conducive, until now, to its association with the conservative right.

Now that these triple phenomena, the silence of youth, the appearance of the Union Nationale, and the estrangement of the clergy, have been elucidated, there remains to be examined the position held by French-Canadian nationalism as an active force in Quebec today.

V

We are led to recognize the existence of three main trends in contemporary French-Canadian nationalism, and it is not a little strange to find that the majority of those in the forefront of each group once stood shoulder to shoulder under the banner of common loyalties. The three trends may be called those of the traditionalists, the reactionaries, and the reformers, or perhaps more properly, conservative, radical, and "social."

In contrast to present-day usage, I use the epithets traditionalist and conservative without any pejorative connotation. This traditionalist trend, which attracts to it the greatest numbers, but which is declining in face of the "social" trend, may be given in brief the following characteristics: (1) loyalty to the general spirit and style of the nationalism of the inter-war years; (2) the same set of aims and preoccupations as that encountered before, notably the supreme importance accorded to the struggle against enemies "from outside"; (3) an effort to reduce the various differences among French Canadians, and induce them to agree on a few main aims, strictly national in nature; (4) an adhesion to liberal theory in economic and social questions; (5) the priority given to what is politic, and therefore a propensity to judge a government first by what it offers for the immediate advancement or at least the maintenance of French Canada's autonomy and prestige; (6) a defence of the thesis of close liaison and interdependence of "the language and the Faith"; (7) suspicion of what reaches us from France, in the realm of culture as of ideologies, and survival of a certain anti-British attitude.

It is obvious that all these characteristics are not equally true of all the men or groups who share this tendency, but they do describe in essence the stand they take. Among them are to be found men whose sincerity calls for respect, and to whom French Canada is indebted for many

valuable results of their initiative. But among the adherents of this school of thought there generally exists so close a link between the values of catholicism, nationalism, and (economic) liberalism, that the general direction they take can be nothing but conservative, and they have no choice but to exclude reappraisals of anything but secondary questions and methods of action.

A faithful reflection of this school can be found in a newspaper such as the Montreal weekly *Notre Temps*, although it is drifting slowly towards the politics of "engagement" and is tending to rally *la droite épaisse* spoken of by Malraux, in this case the Union Nationale party. It should be recalled that if the traditionalist school does generally extend its allegiance to this party, it does so far from enthusiastically, and as a lesser evil.

The radical wing is, in French-Canadian nationalism, a sporadic phenomenon. It fulfils an emotional requirement for some people, an intellectual one for others. This tendency has never really counted as a political force, and as an ideology has had little more than a limited audience. Its basic aspiration—the constitution of a sovereign French state—is quite legitimate. But let us say that in the present state of affairs such a claim takes on a rather Quixotic air, and furthermore threatens to divert a certain number of talented youngsters from real and immediate tasks. The way in which this tendency nowadays finds expression (to be found in particular in the quarterly *Laurentie*) exhibits two disquieting features: a species of longing for theocracy and something of a sympathy for enterprises fascist in style. Let us stress that this tendency does not carry any weight in the interplay of forces, nor is it liable to influence the evolution of nationalism, but it does illustrate an aspect of the latter.

Finally the youngest, most dynamic, and probably the sole trend which gives any promise for the future: the reformist or "social" nationalism, or, as some of its adversaries are pleased to describe it, "nationalism of the Left."

This trend gathers together in effect most of those whom the dramatic transformation in our society and the stimulating contact with Christian social thought of post-war Western Europe have led to make a complete reappraisal of their position. It was no easy task, and the reappraisal is still not at an end. Nothing better illustrates this difficult, but in many ways inspiring, enterprise than the evolution of a newspaper such as *Le Devoir*. Anyone who compares the tone and slant of this nationalist daily since 1945 with those for instance of the period 1930–44, may

appreciate the revolution undergone by a large body of nationalists. This has become evident in a change of attitude in foreign as well as home politics. It is not without cause that between 1945 and 1948 *Le Devoir* lost about a third of its subscribers (quickly replaced by new ones), all of them people who found it difficult to recognize the expression of "their nationalism" in the paper's new look, in its campaigns for working class trade-unionism, in its denunciation of the Union Nationale as an imposture, in its struggle for free education, in its sympathy for the French Resistance movement and the new left wing. Here in particular can one see in what measure nationalism corresponded for one important section of French-Canadian opinion to a conservative leaning and a right-wing ideology—*droite virile* for some who were active, enthusiastic, and sincere, never sparing themselves, never flinching under "hard knocks," and ardently dedicated to the protection of French values; a *droite épaisse* for others whose nationalism was at bottom nothing but an inactive sentimentalism and traditionalism and was becoming the alibi for their unshakeable conservatism.

From there on, the break was accomplished: since then it has but become wider. The "social nationalists," the champions of this new school, contend, in the face of those who condemn nationalism out of hand as the expression of a sterile nostalgia and of a systematic refusal to recognize progress, that nationalism is humanism, and can therefore assume the claims of all classes of the nation, and wants to see that all have the means to enjoy cultural values. To those who make nationalism a defence of the outward signs of the French presence in Canada, supporters of the new trend answer that nationalism can be conceived of only as a conscious effort at promoting the over-all advancement of the French-Canadian cause, and therefore cannot remain aloof from present-day transformations or more correctly the present-day revolution.

For this group there is neither withdrawal nor refusal. Among those who, to protect the unity of nationalists, would wish to fight for the sake of language and culture only (bilingual cheques and the defence of the French minorities), and those who, with intellectual liberation and social progress as their excuses, frantically burn what their elders worshipped (those who, instead, play "the great Canadian game," no longer have qualms, recognize that Quebec is a province like the others, etc.), the social nationalists are trying to elaborate a synthesis, or more exactly to work out for nationalism an approach to the great problems which the French-Canadian mind has nowadays to face. At the same time this school is applying itself to a far-reaching inquiry into French Canada's

future, and is subjecting to a revision the intellectual orientation of nationalism.

The principal characteristics of the school can be defined thus: (1) a priority for efforts at the advancement of the French-Canadian people over the defence of the French presence against "enemies from outside"; (2) a willingness to take up the legitimate claims of the masses, and to impose respect for what is French by the quality of the French-Canadian nation rather than by constant representations to Ottawa (but without dropping the use of these tactics altogether); (3) a dissociation of nationalism from right-wing ideology and paternalism; (4) a recognition that the need of security among the masses is justified, as is the need for a systematically planned organization in economic and social fields; (5) an urgent desire that nationalism should above all things not be an imposture, or become an alibi for the selfishness of those at the head of affairs, but that it should help towards economic and social advancement just as much as national freeing of the French-Canadian group; (6) the abandonment of the cry "the language, guardian of the Faith," of the alliance of "the throne and the altar," an attitude which coincides with a rewarding "aclericalism" and the search for a more authentic practice of Christianity; (7) liberalism in thought, and an open door to all the great contemporary trends; (8) the adoption of an adult attitude to France, which does away with "intellectual colonialism" but avidly seeks contacts with the most compelling and the most high-minded trends in contemporary French thought, this in practice leading neo-nationalism into contact with the young French left wing, from *L'Express* to *Esprit* by way of *Témoignage Chrétien*; (9) the discarding of a militant anti-British policy, the effort to promote the exchange of ideas with the more enlightened elements of the Anglo-Canadian universities, and at the same time, a very noticeable guardedness where American influences are concerned, "Americanism" being thought of as the number one danger for the whole of Canada, as it is for French Canada alone; (10) the ruling out of separatism as well as centralization: "social nationalism" aims at a strong defence of provincial autonomy, but only on condition that it be a vehicle for a large-scale policy of liberation and progress in all fields.

Whereas the traditionalist school used to see in nationalism essentially a way of defending Quebec's rights in the realm of politics and of protecting French minorities on the cultural plane, considering economic and social policies "free matters" (and hence standing surety for the existing state of affairs), the new school holds that nationalism must be

in touch with the whole problem, the revolution—or the growing pains—which French Canada is undergoing, and must find for it an all-embracing solution. While the first body of opinion would seek to struggle against everything that threatens to lessen the French character of Quebec, or which poaches on our government's preserves, the second aims primarily at combatting anything in Quebec which oppresses man, or raises obstacles to his full development, and aims at challenging any government which does not use all the authority at its disposal to further the advancement of the whole nation. Why, after all, should one fight for "Quebec's French character" if beneath the surface there lies a threat to human dignity?

This twin approach to the French-Canadian question is the crux of today's conflict between the two schools, the traditionalist group receiving, on occasion, the support of the radical coterie.

Perhaps these divisions were adumbrated in the conflicts arising between preceding generations. But we cannot say that there was ever this kind of break in the past. For this time it is a break, and not only a disagreement over the means, style, and timing of action: it is a clash between two conceptions of nationalism. The present-day crisis of French Canada, acting as a catalyst, was destined to bring this duality to a head, a duality which had remained dormant as long as economico-social problems did not appear to be becoming acute. I know full well that some among us take exception to the term "crisis," and prefer to talk of French Canada's "finding its feet." Such discussion is unprofitable and puerile, for the country could not properly find its feet without the help of a crisis.

However, one thing which those who despise nationalism must admit, French-Canadian nationalism, illustrating more than any other current the crisis of French Canada, proves eloquently and grippingly just how far it is today not the mere expression of the refusal and nostalgia of a few, but an accurate expression of an ever-present facet of the French-Canadian soul. If in the contemporary revolution for which Quebec is the stage, French-Canadian nationalism had steered clear of rough weather, people would then have had the right to talk of the emptiness of its pretensions, and would have been justified in seeing in them the product of sentimentalism or sectarianism.

We have had satisfying evidence that events have happened quite differently. A new school of thought has undertaken to make a synthesis between the need of a firm loyalty to ourselves and the requirements of the new order of things; this school has been led to break with the tra-

ditionalist school. But even the latter has not remained indifferent to the phenomenon, and many of its representatives have shown their concern in a way which does them honour and gives hope in the distant future of a reconciliation.

We could not end this rapid survey of the situation of French-Canadian nationalism without at least mentioning the very worthwhile activities of the Institute of History of the University of Montreal. It is of course understood that here we are dealing not with another current of nationalism but with authentic scientific work inspired by a passionate attachment to French values. If French Canadians have gained a better understanding of the great adventure of New France, it is thanks to a team of young historians, constantly up-to-date in their attention to the demands of research and methodology, who have had before them the example of Canon Groulx. His figure continues to enlighten and inspire all national action in French Canada, all the more so as the Canon has elected to remain aloof from the debates engaged in by nationalists. The works of Frégault, Brunet, and Séguin have scotched the legend of a French-Canadian society at its origins purely peasant and conservative, and have shown that on the contrary it was a dynamic society, in which the trade and working-class elements had been uppermost and in which on the eve of the Conquest a powerful and active middle class had formed.

The work of the Institute of History has had all the stronger repercussions since its workers have not boggled at analysing the current evolution of the French-Canadian group. They have sometimes been criticized for falling into excessive pessimism. At all events one thing is certain, and that is that their analysis is based on the most scrupulous lucidity, and that their pessimism, if indeed such a pessimism exists, is bracing for a people all too ready to be satisfied with prospects of a survival that is still not guaranteed.

VI

Surely it is not impossible, even today, in 1958, in the absence of a "philosophy," to discover a certain number of characteristics shared by the various currents of French-Canadian nationalism, a common denominator, so to speak? However wide the gulf may now be between the two main schools, it is incontestable that something marks them as being connected with nationalism. Two major characteristics are: (1) a special vigilance and disquiet regarding French Canada's future and (2) the

admission, explicit or implicit according to the case, that a French Canadian's prime loyalty is to Quebec. To be more specific: both schools believe that, in the scale of values, and given the distribution of powers between the federal and the provincial governments, Quebec takes pride of place over Ottawa, and that the relation between Quebec and the federal authority is necessarily of a different type from that existing between the other provinces and Ottawa, and involves more.

Nevertheless the main fact to be noted, and remembered, about French-Canadian nationalism is that it is undergoing a crisis. It is a crisis because the nationalists are divided, because nationalism is sounding its own conscience, because youth is waiting. Yet it is a beneficial crisis, if only because it has emphasized the extent of a transformation whose effects French Canada has been feeling over the past fifteen years or so; a necessary crisis, for without it nationalism, powerless to renew itself, would have been swept away; and a crisis which has permitted the appearance of what is no doubt the only formula capable of opening up for French Canada the possibilities of a renewal that is not a disavowal, of an adaptation that is not an abdication.

To be sure, there is no guarantee that the synthesis which is being worked out hand in hand with everyday problems will ever see the light of day, or that the great political formation which we are awaiting will successfully find in it its inspiration. Come what may, such a synthesis is probably our last chance.

In view of the revolt (wholesome in principle yet often hazardous in its expression) of a younger generation which will no longer fight for mere slogans of the "defence of the French heritage" type, of the dangerous threat of Americanization, insidious and on the human plane injurious, of the gradual evolution towards a unitary state, political and social conservatism shows the extent of the harm it has caused us, and its powerlessness today to organize the slightest resistance. The spectacle of a Union Nationale government to all intents and purposes handing over the natural resources of Quebec to American capital, when at the same time it is turning its police out against the French-Canadian workers' unions, reveals the downfall of conservative nationalism. Repudiated by organized labour, by the intellectuals, by university youth, this way of thinking (if it is permissible to speak of "thinking") and this kind of conduct are condemned. One must not be deluded by the Union Nationale's present electoral power, and the seeming predominance even now of traditional conservative thought. History has recorded its failure, and youth voiced its condemnation.

What remains then? Either the gradual disappearance of our heritage until it is no more than a wretched pitiful relic, through surrender in face of the double onslaught of Americanism and federal centralism; or a reawakening that will save us by bringing into play a grand policy inspired by that synthesis which social nationalism intends to express, and which promises great things. Certain signs justify our belief that this reawakening will come. Roughly two centuries after the Conquest, French Canada is gambling for its existence once again. But this time it seems it can count on the active sympathy of a portion of Anglo-Canadian opinion, which is beginning to understand that Canada's claim to be a truly sovereign and distinct state depends on the survival of French Canada in all its vigour, and that French-Canadian nationalism is seeking, in its new form, to be a humanism.

THE ECONOMY OF QUEBEC

Pierre Harvey

In Canada, the west and the east, more or less agricultural, are usually contrasted with the central provinces which are highly industrialized. Rightly so. A glance at a series of maps of manufacturing industries in Canada is sufficient to show that such industries are highly concentrated in Ontario and Quebec, and this is true of each of the seventeen industries listed in the Standard Industrial Classification (Dominion Bureau of Statistics).[1] A rapid, statistical analysis of occupations in the labour force of each province also reveals that Ontario and Quebec constitute a central unit, with one-third of its workers in manufacturing and mining, whereas in the neighbouring provinces, Manitoba and New Brunswick, only one-fifth of the workers are concentrated in these industries.

But this tripartite division of Canadian territory east of the Rockies remains, nevertheless, a superficial one.[2] In actual fact, Ontario's economy differs extremely from that of Quebec; and Quebec itself is more than just one of the ten political subdivisions of Canada, it is also an economic region with marked characteristics. To state that Quebec constitutes an "economic region" makes it, of course, immediately imperative to define the *category* thus used, and may involve us, from the outset, in a theoretical debate whose terms have not until now been clearly defined. However, it is evident that if we understand "economic region" to mean an area within which economic activities are at once original and closely integrated around a core of some sort, the definition in no way fits the province of Quebec. On the contrary, as we shall have occasion to show later, the provincial area is in fact subdivided into about ten primary regions which are, in most cases, very loosely connected with one another. Moreover, the most important activities are often national or include several provinces in their geographical extension: the case of the pulp and paper industry is the most outstanding among many others of the same type. But an economic region may be defined as an area in

which problems that are common to a broader geographical entity constantly assume special characteristics, and in which specific problems are present that do not occur elsewhere. It is especially in this sense that we may say of the province of Quebec that it differs greatly from Ontario, in spite of the similarities already mentioned.

Let us look, for instance, at the problem of the stability of national employment. No other economic question has received more attention in the last twenty years, both from specialists and from the man in the street. It is a known fact that when the average of unemployed in Canada is roughly 100 for every 1000 employed, there are 75 unemployed in Ontario to 125 in Quebec. On the other hand, since the end of post-war reconstruction the relative fluctuation of unemployment from year to year seems constantly greater in Ontario than in Quebec. Therefore the general problem of employment does not have the same characteristics in the two central provinces and would often seem to call for separate adjustments in economic policy in each.[3] Let us now consider the population of the two provinces concerned: one has an Anglo-Protestant culture, the other a French-Catholic culture. This is a phenomenon of great importance even for an economic analysis as free as possible from any emotional bias. This, for instance, is largely responsible for the manner in which the population of these two provinces grows: in Ontario it increases primarily by immigration, while in Quebec the increase is due to the birth-rate. This produces two different labour markets, requires different public investments, and creates different consumers' markets.[4] The present disparity of the industrial structure of the two provinces can probably be explained, to a great extent, by this cultural divergence and its economic influences.

We could discuss this subject at great length. However, this paper is not about central Canada but about Quebec only. We have wanted only to show, in a summary way, that there is nothing artificial about the confines of the region we have chosen to write about and that "Quebec" is not a mere political fiction but, on the contrary, closely corresponds to a reality which is sufficiently particularized to allow us to make a valid analysis in strictly economic terms. This does not mean that such an analysis can be made without any reference to "central Canada." On the contrary, there remain between the two provinces which constitute this "industrial centre" enough similarities to make numerous comparisons possible and profitable. In any case we shall often resort to such comparisons in the following pages.

In the economic area which is the province of Quebec, the distribution

of industry is so well known that it is not necessary to dwell upon this point at length. Let us, however, give a few general indications as a background for what we shall say later. It is obviously the manufacturing industries which employ the largest quota of man-power, i.e., 32 per cent of the total. Agriculture at present accounts for only 13 per cent, coming after services (20 per cent) and commerce and finance (15 per cent). Woodcutting and mining employ less than 5 per cent of the workers. To state this information in another way, it may be said that in the province of Quebec one-fifth of the man-power is employed in the direct utilization of natural resources, two-fifths in the manufacturing and building industries, and two-fifths in transport, commerce, finance, and services.[5] About twenty years ago the proportions were quite different; agriculture and manufacturing industries each employed 22 per cent of the workers. Since then, manufacturing has gained in relative importance almost exactly what has been lost by agriculture.[6]

Nothing in the above makes the province of Quebec really different from Ontario. But if we examine the general results of these two economies, differences become noticeable. Personal income per capita in the province of Quebec does not quite reach three-quarters of that of Ontario. The difference is less marked for wage earners but nevertheless it stands at 15 per cent. The average net income of Quebec farms does not exceed two-thirds that of Ontario farms. And finally, the value of per capita production in Quebec is barely more than three-quarters of that in Ontario. The causes of such disparities are numerous. However, we can try to reduce them to a few headings, as this, in itself, will possibly make it easier to assign to Quebec's economy its proper place within the broader entity known as central Canada.

Research on this subject has already attracted the attention of many observers, even though, for lack of means, it has not gone beyond the stage of establishing a descriptive framework. Some of this work is not without oddities. An "expert" had the preposterous idea, hardly twelve years ago, of explaining these disparities as being due to deficiencies in education, in sanitation, and in nutrition.[7] The problem was thus easily dismissed or, in any case, became merely one of school attendance and dietetics. Even a serious publication like the *Financial Post* was taken in.

Let us forget about dietetics and examine instead a map of the central part of Canada and the United States—the province of Quebec then appears clearly handicapped. It is in fact situated almost entirely north of the settled part of Ontario in the midst of the Canadian Shield, whereas the neighbouring province is largely surrounded by the Great Lakes and

thus has a different climate. Moreover, the province of Quebec is on the northern rim of North America whereas the inhabited part of Ontario penetrates deep into the centre of the continent; finally, this peninsula forms a compact mass covered with a close network of large urban areas, for the most part surrounded by good agricultural zones; the province of Quebec, on the contrary, is divided into several zones isolated from one another: the St. Lawrence valley in the centre, Abitibi-Temiscamingue to the north-west, the Saguenay–Lake St. John district to the north, etc. The St. Lawrence valley itself is by no means a homogeneous whole, even if we do not take into account the recent new settlements of the North Shore.[8] Thus, compared to Ontario, Quebec—merely as a result of geography—has serious handicaps: a severe climate, extreme dispersal of centres of economic activity, and, above all (because of the instability and scarcity of commercial relations between the Maritimes and the rest of the country), its isolation as a whole, on the rim of the Great Lakes region which is the centre of gravity of the North American economy. Quebec's economy bears the marks of these natural handicaps.

First, let us look at agriculture. Almost everywhere we see that most of the farms are on a bare subsistence level. The area around Montreal is the only exception. On the other hand, if we examine the source of farming's gross cash income, we see that dairy farming, and pig farming which usually goes with it, account almost everywhere for about half the returns. If forest products are included, the proportion rises to two-thirds, always excepting the Montreal area where vegetables come first. This means that almost all over the province of Quebec, agriculture either consists of subsistence farming, or is highly specialized, usually in the same type of products, especially milk.

If only this milk could be sold as a liquid, there would not be so many drawbacks. But the geographical dispersal already mentioned is further complicated by a lack of important urban areas: Quebec has only half a dozen centres of more than 30,000 inhabitants, half as many as Ontario. Indeed the urban population is concentrated in a few very large centres and in a host of very small ones. That fact forces farmers to convert their milk, at the source, into a commodity which can be moved more easily. For this reason, in half the counties, butter alone accounts for 25 to 50 per cent of a farmer's cash income. The general state of the butter market in Canada is well known. Moreover, since the growing season is too short, because of the climate, it is not easy to make the farmers change over to other crops: therefore, for the most part, Que-

bec's agriculture seems doomed, for the present at any rate, to precisely the type of production which keeps it relatively poor. No doubt output is sometimes rather low, but in such circumstances improving the output often leads merely to an increased number of drawbacks. Therefore new large urban centres in each of the districts of the province would seem to be the first necessary condition for bringing about a really prosperous agriculture. In other words, the improvement and stabilization of the agricultural situation seems to depend on industrial growth and its development over the whole of the inhabitable territory of the province. This agricultural policy may sound like a paradox, and is in any case difficult to carry out, since geography has exerted and continues to exert its tyranny over the manufacturing industry.[9]

Let us now examine this industry, choosing a few of the many points of view which might be of particular interest for our purpose. We shall study only three of them, selecting these because they raise the most widely discussed problems, and also open up interesting perspectives on the conditions of growth of Quebec's economy. We shall start with a quick glance at the relative importance of the man-power employed in the various industries, dividing these according to the level of average pay. Afterwards we shall see how these various industries are divided according to the level of productivity. Finally, we shall give a few particulars on the geographical distribution of industry, endeavouring to find the economic significance of such a distribution.

First, let us examine industry according to wage levels, using a very simple form of analysis in order to prevent this article from becoming too cumbersome. As an index of wage levels, let us take the average hourly earnings in each industry within Canada. At the top of the scale, we have the petroleum and coal industry, at the bottom, clothing. The average hourly rate at the top of the scale is approximately twice that found at the bottom. Let us further subdivide this scale into two equal segments with the establishing of an hourly wage rate exactly half way between the highest (petroleum and coal products) and the lowest (clothing). Let us say that this half-way line indicates the division between the industries in which the pay is "high" and those in which it is "low." It will then appear, that in Quebec, 46 per cent of industrial workers are in industries above the dividing line and 54 per cent in industries below this line. In Ontario the situation is entirely different: 64 per cent of the workers are above the line, and only 36 per cent below. If we take this lower group, which in Ontario represents 36 and in Quebec 54 per cent of the man-power, and subdivide it further into two sections following the same procedure, that is, by striking a half-way line between

the highest rate and the lowest rate, this is what we get: in Quebec 42 per cent of the man-power is in industries where the hourly rate is, on the average, below this last dividing line, and the rest (12 per cent) above the line. In Ontario, 26 per cent is below, 10 per cent above. If we may be a little bold, with a view to shedding some light on reality, let us classify industrial man-power into three kinds of industries, those where the hourly rate is high, those where it is average, and those where it is low. In Quebec as well as in Ontario the middle category would then seem to have the same relative importance: 12 per cent in one case and 10 per cent in the other. But the high pay sectors would employ 64 per cent of the man-power in Ontario and 46 per cent in Quebec. Inversely, industries in which the pay is low have 26 per cent of the workers in Ontario and 42 per cent in Quebec. The difference is great between the two provinces, and the economic consequences resulting from this are serious indeed.

But if the manufacturing industries of the two central provinces are considered from the point of view of the workers' "productivity" per capita, the picture is entirely different.[10] As "productivity-index" we take the net value of the production per capita and per industry in Canada and classify the industries according to this scale; at the top, we find once more the petroleum and coal industries but at the bottom we now have the leather products. Repeating here the procedure used above in regard to wages, we subdivide the scale first in two parts with a line placed exactly half way between the highest per capita "productivity" and the lowest. We then divide the lower half again in two segments in the same manner, and further establish three categories called high per capita productivity industries, average productivity industries, and low productivity industries. This time, to weigh the importance of each industry, the criterion will not be man-power but the relative importance of the industry in comparison with the production value of all industry as a whole, and we obtain the following results. In Ontario 23 per cent of the total value of the manufacturing production comes from high productivity sectors compared to 34 per cent in Quebec; for industries of average productivity Ontario's contribution is 63 per cent, Quebec's 41 per cent; in industries of low productivity, Ontario accounts for 14 per cent of the production and Quebec 25 per cent. Here again we see a noticeable difference. But in this last instance Quebec is ahead with one-third of its production coming from the highest productivity industries. Ontario's industries, on the other hand, are concentrated among types having an average productivity.

Let us again resist the temptation to build upon these simple statistics

and examine instead the geographical distribution of these industries within the province of Quebec itself. Simplifying the problem and reducing it to fundamentals obviously calls for a division into two categories only: metropolitan Montreal on the one hand, the rest of the province on the other. We notice then that 60 per cent of all the manufacturing establishments in Quebec having fifty hands or more are in the area of metropolitan Montreal. The percentage varies a great deal between industrial sectors, from 28 per cent (wood products) to 83 per cent (petroleum and coal products). If we assume that a concentration of 50–75 per cent constitutes a norm which can be explained by the force of attraction of the Montreal district, we then find six out of seventeen industries with a degree of concentration below the norm, and five industries with a greater degree of concentration. Industries with an infra-normal concentration are either those which depend on local resources (raw material or electric power) or those requiring cheap labour in great quantity. Industries concentrated around Montreal all seem to depend on this metropolitan area either as a consumer's market or as a reserve of more or less specialized man-power, or again as a great focal point of national or international trade.

Summing up, we might say that in the province of Quebec a large proportion of industrial workers are employed in industries in which pay is normally low. On the other hand, industries having a great per capita "productivity" play a much more important part in the total production of Quebec than they do in Ontario, where we find more industries of average "productivity." Thirdly, the concentration of enterprises per industry in the Montreal area is high, except in the cases already mentioned. Yet among the industries which are not highly based on the Montreal area, a certain number of those which depend upon local raw material or electric power are precisely those for which the Canadian average also shows a very high per capita production, and top salaries.

We shall now endeavour to put some order into all this apparently scattered material, and extract therefrom a few general factors which may help us to understand Quebec's economy. But here we must leave the solid ground of statistical data in order to put forth a few hypotheses, which have already been proposed in various studies of limited scope, and would require extensive research for complete verification.

It is no doubt safe to say that, at the start of the great period of Canadian industrialization, at the end of the last century, the central part of the continent had already begun to attract a large part of the North American industrial activity. With the progressive shifting of the economic centre of gravity towards the Great Lakes region becoming

more evident every year, the province of Quebec, because of its geographical position, now found itself relegated to the outer edge of the great marketing areas which were being developed and had to rely upon very special localizing factors in order to attract within its borders a share of these new activities. Thus three circumstances probably worked to its advantage: first, the presence of Montreal, a centre already in existence, at the head of the ocean navigation service, yet situated close to areas of intense activity; second, a countryside chronically overpopulated since the first decades of the century; and finally the existence in Quebec of certain very valuable natural resources. Thanks to its strategic position, Montreal was able to hold some of the industries processing the raw materials which came from abroad through the St. Lawrence River or from the heart of the continent by way of the Great Lakes. The very large labour force available has, for its part, attracted industries which needed cheap man-power in abundance; lastly the local natural resources have made it possible (not without help from public authorities, be it said) to bring to the area the new manufacturing industries which are now there.

It must be noted, however, that these localizing factors, such as they were, were not altogether favourable to the healthy development of Quebec's economy. In fact, for a diversified industry to develop, the province of Quebec, because of its marginal geographical position, should have had quite early on a flourishing home market. However, the growth of metropolitan Montreal resulted in the concentration of a very high proportion of commercial and industrial activities on the province's very border while the rest of the territory remained unaffected.[11] Secondly, an abundance of low-salary industries, coupled with a constantly increasing population, had the result of lowering salaries even in those industries which normally paid good salaries in Canada as a whole. Finally, industries directly processing raw material were themselves, owing to the force of circumstances, scattered over a very large area in places which were almost all isolated from one another, because of distance, topography, and sparsity of population. These conditions were to give rise to small individualized local economies which, however, were difficult to reach from any given point in the province. Moreover, because of the localization of the natural resources used, local industries almost came to exercise a virtual monopoly over the local labour demand, when the labour supply was often abundant and the basic wage recognized as "normal" throughout the province was largely influenced by the dominance of low-wage industries. Such industries' help towards building a prosperous home market was therefore proportionately

smaller, and in any case it has not been commensurate with their contribution to the value of the province's industrial production as a whole. However, the constant struggle of labour organizations in these industries to have Quebec wages brought into line with those of Ontario is now correcting this state of affairs, little by little.

This picture may seem to be needlessly pessimistic, considering the prosperity which Quebec enjoys in any case. Since public or private propaganda agencies are always ready to stress the favourable aspects of the Quebec economy, it may not be amiss to give some time to the study of the principal difficulties hindering its growth. In this connection some people have recently called it an underdeveloped economy. The term is inappropriate, unless one stretches the limits of such a category, to the extent of making it meaningless; with relation to the economy of the United States, all Canadian economy would then be underdeveloped and this is obviously absurd. Quebec's economy is an integral part of central Canada's, and we must judge it in the light of that context. Thus, Quebec appears to us not underdeveloped—a meaningless statement—but handicapped, when compared with the neighbouring province. Its main handicap is at present due to its marginal geographic position in relation to the centre of the North American continent, a fact which forces the province to rely to a great extent on its own home market in order to ensure a certain broadening of its industrial foundations. But the very development of such a market meets with definite obstacles: the dispersal of economic activities, the predominance of low-paying industries and the constantly increasing population. All these difficulties have not been as apparent lately owing to the tremendous activity shown especially in the field of mining. But as soon as this flurry calms down somewhat, it is highly probable that the divergence between Ontario and Quebec will again begin to increase, unless, of course, we have speedy recourse to economic measures adapted to this situation.

Public administrations have paid very little attention, until now, to the rationalization of the economic structures of this country and of its separate regions. Once the work of digging canals and building transcontinental railways was finished, a task which oftener than not was political and even military rather than economic, the development of the territory, in accordance with the imperatives of dyed-in-the-wool liberalism was left entirely to private interests alone; within national boundaries, the brutal play of inter-regional comparative costs has been somewhat interrupted only by the structure of railway rates and by certain survival subsidies. Because of its favourable position, Ontario could only benefit

from such a system. For Quebec it has been far less advantageous: it is not by mere chance, for instance, that Ontario should be at the present moment endowed with a railway system at least twice as dense as that of Quebec; even the administration of the great public services has followed the demands of the liberal doctrine.[12]

Since the war, the problem has become more complex. The federal government has adopted an active anti-cyclical policy. Thus, as far as business conditions are concerned, the liberal dogma has officially been cast aside. In applying this policy, however, a strictly national concept of our economy has been retained, and this seems to have had the consequence of increasing the differences in economic development among the various Canadian regions; in this case, also, automatic mechanisms have favoured Ontario.[13]

Therefore, the competition between Ontario and Quebec leads these provinces to adopt different attitudes. Ontario may preserve a liberal policy of nearly complete purity when dealing with the development of its resources, particularly if the anti-cyclical policy of the federal government permits it, in a period of intense economic activity, to retain or attract the bulk of scarce factors of production. Quebec must accept the necessity of using its resources with more care: liberalism is for Quebec a costly luxury and specific planning of the development of the territory seems to be imperative. The dispersal of primary regions, which is one of the main reasons for such planning, would also facilitate the further application of the plan itself by dividing between the separate localities different aspects of the whole problem. In each of such primary regions, agriculture couid be better integrated with the needs of the local urban centres, provided that these centres have been allowed to grow under the spur of an increasing degree of local processing of local raw materials.

After links of a satisfactory character were established between primary regions, labour mobility would increase and thus eliminate the inevitability of low wages. Through the development of such primary regions, the province of Quebec would therefore acquire a large internal market, without which it would remain a zone of transition between the Maritimes and Ontario, with Montreal serving as a hinge on its border. Evidently planned development will demand that large amounts of capital be sought elsewhere in Canada and abroad. This need will introduce additional difficulties. Furthermore, the distribution of jurisdiction between local and central authorities raises other problems, that are familiar enough, although until now they have been set aside rather than solved.

NOTES

1 B. Brouillette, *Les Principales Industries manufacturières du Canada* (Service de Documentation économique, Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales de Montréal, 1957.

2 British Columbia, because of the Rockies, is so obviously different that it can be left out in order to simplify our discussion.

3 In passing, let us say that the all too famous federal-provincial debate, conducted almost entirely in constitutional terms on the one hand and in doctrinal terms on the other, could have shed some of its violence much sooner if the actual conditions for applying the policies advocated had been carefully considered.

4 Concerning investment problems, see J. Henripin, "Observations sur la situation démographique des Canadiens français," *L'Actualité économique*, XXXII (Montreal, 1957).

5 The three groups make up the industries called primary, secondary, and tertiary, according to classifications in general use.

6 Patrick Allen, "Tendances récentes des occupations au Canada," *L'Actualité économique*, XXXII (Montreal, 1956).

7 G. Jackson, *Facts in the Case* (Toronto, 1944).

8 These various parts of the provincial territory have been minutely delimited by Professors R. Blanchard and B. Brouillette, in their numerous studies on the subject. Here we shall refer to them as the *primary* regions inside the wider area of the province itself.

9 Naturally other measures are also essential, particularly a rational organization of markets, especially now that great food chains require enormous quantities of standard products, a circumstance which tends to exclude isolated local producers from the market even of early out-of-season fruits and vegetables.

10 The word "productivity" used here could give rise to a lengthy technical discussion. To avoid this, we use it in quotation marks and carry on.

11 It remains clear, however, that it is this growth of the city of Montreal which has made it possible to keep in the country the man-power which before was attracted to New England.

12 Cf. Province of Quebec, Chamber of Commerce, *Report to the Royal Commission of Enquiry on the Economic Prospects of Canada* (1956), 37.

13 Cf. P. Harvey, "Conjoncture et structures: les perspectives spaciales du plein emploi au Canada," *Communication au XXIVe Congrès de l'ACFAS* (November 1956) printed in *L'Actualité économique*, October-December 1956. Thirteen years previously, H. A. Innis had predicted that if it were not closely geared to the regional structure of the Canadian economy, full employment would "become a racket on the part of the central provinces for getting and keeping what they can" (cf. "Decentralization and Democracy," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, August 1943, p. 329). Since this was written, however, it seems that the combination of a short-term national economic policy with a completely liberal attitude towards the design of the structures, has meant that the above-mentioned "racket" has mainly operated to the advantage of Ontario.

FRENCH CANADIANS AND DEMOCRACY

Arthur Maheux

The attitudes towards democracy of the two main groups, the English- and the French-speaking, of Canada are not quite, and can hardly be, the same. The difference in the interpretation of democracy creates some friction between both groups, as it is easy to see by reading the Canadian newspapers; it affects the efforts made to realize national unity. The word "unity" carries several meanings: it may mean total fusion, or amalgamation, or conglomeration, or moral union, moral *entente*; and there are at present partisans of all of these varieties. In a country composed of a large majority and many minorities, it is quite natural for the majority to wish that the minorities be absorbed into and identified with itself. Yet not all minorities are equally vulnerable. One whose culture is manifestly inferior would be easier to assimilate than one possessing a high culture.

The last two World Wars, and the progress made by the new sciences, principally sociology and anthropology, have changed our opinion about cultures. It is commonly admitted today that any culture, even though considered inferior by us, should not be destroyed; and we regret and blame the extinction of the Mayas and the Incas, and we are inclined to protect the Maoris and the Basutos. We deplore racial segregation. We have come to think that our ancestors, our grandfathers, were wrong in their treatment of minorities, and especially here in Canada, in their treatment of the local Indians, the Acadians, the half-breeds, and even the French Canadians.

French Canadians have inherited the French civilization; they know its high value; they want to preserve it, and add to it according to their own genius, while trying to come to a compromise over some details. English Canadians have also received a cultural heritage which they want to preserve. Since these inheritances are not exactly the same, they are bound to collide. If we ask a French Canadian what are the elements of his French heritage, he will list, in the following order, religion,

philosophy, language, literature, history, the fine arts, economics, law, and government. An English Canadian lists the same elements but he will put them in a different order: for him the first items on the list are government and economics; religion follows after; and by government he means democracy. That difference of opinion should not be slighted; it is of real importance in the daily life of the Canadian nation. If both groups disagree about the value and the working of democratic institutions, they are bound to clash, sometimes bitterly.

Is it possible to discover the reasons why French Canadians do not hold the same opinions about or adopt the same attitude towards democracy as English Canadians? It is possible, in large measure, if we go back to the past, if we examine the teaching given to the people about government.

Those who have shaped French-Canadian opinion in this matter are the clergy and the lay teachers. By clergy I mean bishops, parish priests, priests teaching in the seminaries and colleges; and those other teachers who, though not ordained, make up part of the clergy and are known as Brothers and Sisters. The lay leaders were the seigneurs, and, later, the lawyers and notaries, physicians, and lay teachers.

Members of the clergy all received the same training, religious, philosophical, and classical, and their opinions on civil society sprang from the reading of Greek and Latin writers, from the study of ancient history, philosophy, and theology. These opinions were passed on by the priests to the body of teachers of all the lower grades, and to the people by means of sermons in the church and of teaching in the schools. The lay leaders also drank from the same spring; most of them passed through the classical course, which included elaborate lessons in philosophy and a continuous study of religion.

Can we say that classical studies necessarily inspire youth with a firm conviction that the democratic form of government is the best? It is doubtful. Of course, we admire the Athenians for their splendid effort, even though it turned into failure. When we read the speeches of Demosthenes and the Attic orators, we feel that while they are generally in favour of democracy, they are constantly appealing to moral or ethical attitudes. We derive much the same impression from the historians: Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon. The perusal of the great tragedies insists still more on the moral aspect of politics. The philosophers—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle—do not seem to have believed solidly in democracy. Aristotle gave greater importance to the study of the problem than any. The *Politics* is still the most complete of all the books that have

been written on democracy and government, yet in the classical course very little attention, if any, was given to it.

Anyhow, the clear impression remains that the value of a form of government is in direct relation to moral behaviour, to the weaknesses of human nature, to the measure of knowledge which may reside in the minds of the people. The Roman Republic worked well as long as there were men like the austere Cato. Cicero put the problem clearly when he wrote, "The people consider as the leader of the nation the one who assures the good rather than the people's appetites."

The French-Canadian student of classical antiquity, therefore, is left with the opinion that any form of government will work well if there is wisdom, common sense, morality, virtue, and austerity. Practically, one has the same opinion after reading Walter Lippmann's *The Public Philosophy* (1955).

The "moral" attitude of the French Canadian is not a myth; it is a deep reality. His long and serious training in religion and ethics makes him prompt to look first at the moral aspect of public and private matters; it is part and parcel of his way of life. In history, in politics, too, he will look first to the moral. He is confirmed in his attitude by Holy Scripture, and he quite willingly subscribes to the saying in the Book of Wisdom, "Those who shall have observed justice with a spirit of justice, these shall be praised as just," let them be king, emperor, president, bishop, for all have to give account to the Supreme Judge. So spoke and speak his spiritual leaders, so his lay leaders; so speak history, experience, philosophy, religion. So speaks religion: one has only to read the various documents on public affairs written by the Popes and the *mandements* issued by the bishops in each diocese. Being Roman Catholic, the French Canadians acknowledge the Pope as their spiritual leader in all matters affecting religion; they see in him authority—religious, moral, and social authority; and, consequently, the directions he gives are of exceptional value.

From Pope Pius VI (1774–99) down to the present Pope, Pius XII, the pontifical documents are full of reflection and advice on the conduct of public affairs, on the qualities and deficiencies of rulers, on the duties and the rights of subjects. The Popes have always insisted on the submission due to legitimately established temporal power. They have always reserved the rights of the Church in the religious, moral, and social fields; always reminded the rulers of their duties towards the people; always condemned tyranny, totalitarianism, dictatorship. They have spoken their mind on democracy. Before Leo XIII, while insisting

on submission to established authority, they doubted the value of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, as formulated by the French Revolution.

Leo XIII (1878–1903) was the first to take a more conciliatory attitude towards republics and democracies. He and his successors were anxious to make a distinction between true and false democracy. Leo XIII said, "The Church repudiates none of the various systems of government provided they be apt in themselves to procure the good of the citizens." Pius XII says, "It is hardly necessary to recall that according to the Church's teachings, it is not forbidden to prefer the moderate popular governments, provided the Catholic doctrine on the origin and the exercise of public authority be safe." He also defends the rights of the citizen to

express his personal opinion on the duties and sacrifices imposed upon him, and not to be forced into submission unless he be listened to. . . . People and mass (mass of people, mob) are two different concepts. . . . A people is a person conscious of its responsibilities and of its own convictions. The "mass" is moved from outside . . . is an instrument, in the hands of a State that knows how to use it skilfully . . . and it [the mass] is the main enemy of true democracy and of its ideal of liberty and equality. . . . Equality degenerates into a mechanical levelling, into a uniformity without shades.

Later, Pius XII says,

The democratic state . . . must . . . possess the power of commanding with true and effective authority. . . . The dignity of the political authority is the dignity of its participation in God's authority. . . . If the public power . . . does not take into account that relation [between authority and God], if it does not see in its function the mission to realize the order willed by God, then shall come the danger that the egotism (selfishness) of the ruler or of other interests shall prevail upon the essential demands of the political and the social ethics, the danger that the vain appearances of a purely formal democracy shall be only a mask imposed upon what is least democratic.

Another Pope, Pius X, stated (in 1905) what is to be expected from citizens: a Christian education in the family, unswerving observance of duty and impartiality and disinterestedness, loyalty to traditions, a mind open to all social necessities; and from the representatives of the people: high moral thinking, practical aptitudes, intellectual capacity—all of which mean death or life, prosperity or decadence, to democracy.

It would be easy to multiply quotations. The reader will remark the insistence on the moral aspects of public life, of democratic life. The bishops' letters (*mandements*) strike exactly the same note. Such is the

doctrine instilled into the mind of the French Canadian; and I doubt the equivalent could be found for the non-Catholic Canadian.

The classical training in the French-Canadian seminaries and colleges does not inspire the student with enthusiasm for democracy. The ecclesiastical documents insist on the moral dangers of democracy. There is no discrepancy between the two. And the teaching of philosophy? Research in this field led me to examine practically all the philosophy textbooks that have been in use at the Quebec Seminary since the beginning of the eighteenth century, and the remarks that follow are based on this work.

Until 1760 Quebec was governed by the French monarchy, an "absolute" monarchy. As the textbooks were written and printed in France, quite naturally they praised absolute monarchy and omitted to mention democracy, or mentioned it only to condemn it. The province was ruled by the British military from 1760 to 1764, and from 1763 to 1791 its government, directed by the king of England, was little different from rule under the French. The democratic system came in 1791, with a Legislative Assembly, and a government in some measure democratic. The textbooks of philosophy continued to come from France. They condemned Rousseau's *Contrat social*, the French Revolution, the idea that authority resided in the people; and they praised absolute monarchy for a time, though later accepting the idea of moderate or constitutional monarchy, as it became in France, while remaining opposed to democracy. All the lay leaders were trained in these opinions. The bishops stressed full submission to the government. The parish priests never mentioned to their flocks the word democracy itself. Their silence was the equivalent of condemnation. For thirty years (1791–1820) French Canadians participated in the elections, quickly learning the tricks of the system, and how to practise them. When the bishops became aware of such practices they wrote to condemn "immorality" in elections, calling attention to the "dangerous ways of democracy," a danger to add to those of the theatre, dancing, or drinking. The moral aspect of the issue was inevitably stressed. The textbooks coming from France or Italy remained the same until about 1900, in spite of the Act of Union (1841) and the British North America Act (1867).

Was there any reaction against the teaching of these textbooks? Yes, in some measure. Among the clergy one is worth mentioning: that of Abbé Jérome Demers, a priest of the Quebec Seminary, a professor of philosophy and sciences in the first half of the nineteenth century. He saw very clearly that the textbooks coming from Europe were not entirely adapted to a French-Canadian audience, and he decided to

write his own textbook, in Latin as was then the rule.[1] He was the first to mention the British parliamentary system. He says that all political systems have advantages and disadvantages because of "human passions" (and here again appears the "moral" side). He condemns tyranny and . . . democracy. This will appear odd in the eyes of a British reader, who believes, I suppose, that the British system was democratic, even in those early times (1820–35). Either Demers did not see it as democratic, or he thought of democracy as a régime without a king, that is, a republic.

It is evident that the Quebec government of the time should have been labelled an autocracy rather than a democracy, since the first right of the Legislative Assembly, that of the control of finances, was denied to it by the governor and the Legislative and Executive Councils. Such a situation could not escape Demers' attention. He was quite close to the government. He was occasionally asked by the Assembly to explain some scientific difficulty, and his students, young men in their twenties, either had parents or relatives in the Assembly, or intended to enter political life as soon as they had graduated. He certainly had to discuss political problems with his students. The main issue at the time was the degree to which the government could be justifiably resisted. One man, Louis-Joseph Papineau, was prominent in the movement of resistance, and he must have exerted a great attraction among the students. Was resistance permissible, when the Church was preaching submission to constituted power? Demers' book was published in 1835, just two years before the Rebellion of 1837–8.

Until that time the textbooks had unanimously condemned resistance as a sin. But French-Canadian politicians and students might well question that statement. There are many kinds of "resistance"; were they all bad and sinful? Was the condemnation in accordance with democratic freedom of speech? The idea of armed resistance was making its way among some groups of Canadians, either English-speaking under Lyon Mackenzie, or French-speaking under Louis-Joseph Papineau. The Church could not approve of such an idea. Demers says, "It is a very serious fault to arm people against the government, under the pretence of reforming abuses." Yet something had to be done in the face of patent abuses, at least by the use of constitutional means. Says Demers,

> In democratic republics, where all civil servants are elected, the people have certainly the right to examine the acts and the administration of government; but they cannot revolt; all they may do legitimately, when there is reason for discontent, is to persuade the electorate that they should name to the various

functions men better able to govern the state, and to redress the abuses introduced by the previous administration.

To such reasoning the Papineau group might have replied: We are not a republic; we are a monarchy which pretends to be a democracy; many of the public functions are not elective; even if we elected a unanimous Assembly, the members' efforts would be opposed and nullified by the *Clique du château*; that clique is violating the laws and the constitution; theirs is moral and political violence, which calls forth violence.

Papineau had his followers, but most of the French Canadians stood by Demers' teaching: that constitutional means should be used to obtain redress. Of the British monarchy Demers says that it would be the best régime "if some abuses were corrected." Such abuses existed in England and in Canada. The people of England were trying to obtain reforms constitutionally; the Canadians should do the same, rather than take up arms.

A new idea appeared in those times which has had a strong influence on French-Canadian politics and is still effective. It is the idea of a "vocation." We find it stated in a philosophical book published in France by Geruzez in 1833.[2]

> Nations really worthy of that name have a particular vocation which is revealed to them by the instinct of their genius. The men who are called to guide the march of such nations must lead them along the line of their vocation. . . . When that vocation is opposed by the leaders of the state, the nation's natural instincts incite it to resistance, and if it cannot win without violence, terrible fights arise called revolutions.

Such a "vocation" is a call from within, from the natural instincts, from the natural genius; in the hands of the clergy it soon became a supernatural call from Heaven. The idea of "vocation" or "mission" spread rapidly and has become almost a commonplace. About the turn of this century, students in seminaries and colleges were called upon at least once a year to write an essay on the peculiar "vocation" or "mission" of the French-Canadian people. The idea certainly helped the resistance to assimilation, the determination to maintain the French cultural heritage, and the strong desire for a religious apostolate. In the political field all attempts against the Catholic religion, the French schools, the separate schools, and the French civil law were deeply resented, and still are.

Papineau's policy was founded on the American and French revolutions, as well as on British constitutional traditions and rights. Papineau even advocated a republic for Canada. He had followers, but the majority

disapproved of his policy. They preferred to use constitutional means to obtain their ends. Jacques Labrie, a physician who had studied medicine at Edinburgh, was one of the leaders of these constitutionalists. He put his trust in British institutions and, believing that they were insufficiently understood, he resolved to educate the people, especially the young people. He found a pamphlet, written by an Englishman named Brooke, giving an historical sketch of the British constitution; choosing those parts most useful to the Canadian reader, Labrie translated them into French, adding a few comments of his own. The French translation appeared under the title of *Premiers rudiments de la constitution britannique* in 1827. It reflects the moderate opinion of the vast majority of French Canadians at the time; they wanted reform, but within the framework of British law. Later, between 1840 and 1867, Georges-Etienne Cartier and Hippolyte Lafontaine were of the same opinion.

The British North America Act ushered in a new era. It inspired high hopes, and seemed to promise equality between the two racial groups. Both languages would be official, with the underlying acceptance of both cultures throughout Canada. But there were disappointments to add to the bitterness left by the past.

The French Canadian is much more Norman than French; his mind is positive, down-to-earth. He judges the tree by its fruits; his motto is "Je me souviens"; he studies his history and he remembers. History tells him that he obtained his most cherished liberties—religion, language, civil law—before there was any democratic process in his country; he obtained them by petitions addressed to the king as his "father" or to the local governor. The rights obtained by the Capitulations (1759, 1760), by the Treaty of Paris (1763), by the Quebec Act (1774), and by petitions (1764 to 1791) had practically nothing to do with democracy. He knows that after the establishment of the so-called democratic process in 1791, he had to fight to maintain the liberties he had already won. He remembers that a democratic régime imposed upon him the Act of Union of 1841, that his tongue was suppressed as an official language, and that he, now in the minority, found himself under a majority which shouted: "This country shall be English at the cost of being British."

Then the hopes of 1867 were shattered. The French language was expelled, along with French culture, from nearly all the provinces. If the French Canadian wanted them he had either to be in the majority or pay thrice for his attachment to his cultural heritage. The fruit of the democratic tree was indeed bitter and never candied. Even today he has

to listen to the yearly bragging of "one school, one language," as if he were of another colour. Even today he has to listen to some English-speaking Canadian telling him, if he dares to speak French: Speak white.

This may seem a sombre picture, but it is realistic and it may explain many of the difficulties that exist between the two groups. The wrong is the iron hand of majority, of number; an iron hand clad with the velvet glove of self-superiority; and it brings to mind Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, and Demers, when they say that "the tyranny of many is much worse than the tyranny of one." No explanation, no excuse will ever make the French Canadian believe that the poor, the very poor, position of French culture, in provinces other than Quebec, is not the effect of tyranny. The very same cry is heard today as in 1838, in the days of Durham: "This country shall be English at the cost of being British." To which the French-Canadian answer is: We agree to be British but not at the cost of being French.

The philosophy text-books written by French Canadians differ greatly from those that came previously from France and Italy. They no longer slight democracy; yet they still warn us against its weaknesses. Lortie's book, in use from 1910 to 1938, and Grenier's books, introduced in 1938 and still in use, offer a somewhat better picture of democracy than their predecessors: it may be a good dish as long as the sauce is strongly moral. They do not praise the "one man, one vote system."

The French Canadians, whether they will or will not, however, live under a democratic régime, and have to make the best of it. In 1920 they organized the society of the Semaines Sociales, for the study of current problems, such as the city, the state, and authority. The theme of their discussion in 1942 was democracy. It was the first attempt to discuss all aspects of the idea. The good and the bad sides of democracy were considered. It was recognized that the democratic system favours on the whole the common good and safeguards fundamental rights, such as freedom of speech, discussion, and religion; and that its deficiencies are accidental rather than essential. It was agreed that the family must come before the individual; that private interests should not prevail over the common good; that the people should not be exploited by or for a political party; that excess of bureaucracy is a danger; that the people's apathy and lack of initiative are too frequent; that democracy may be considered a sort of religion in itself; that democracy does not favour and often represses the *élite*; that corporatism should have a prominent place in government. The Report including these statements was circulated and certainly had an influence on the clergy and on lay leaders.

More recently the problem of democracy has been taken up by the C.B.C. in discussions and forums. The Society for Adult Education has also come into existence. We may say then that the idea of democracy is becoming more alive than ever before in French Canada. The word itself is used by educated persons; as for the common people, they speak of "government by election."

An incident occurred in the summer of 1956 which acted as an explosive. Provincial elections had been held in June, and, as usual, there had been some irregularities in the electoral campaign. That was not new; we have only to read the various bishops' *mandements* since 1820, or thereabouts, to find numerous warnings given to the people about immorality in elections. Laymen had also occasionally condemned such immorality. So there was no surprise when two gentlemen raised their voices against immorality in electoral campaigns. Their statement was intended for the clergy, since these gentlemen were also clergymen, but the text of their statement appeared in some newspapers, and people were only too prompt in relating their remarks to the election that had taken place a month before.

There really was a commotion, mainly because the French Canadians do not like their priests to meddle in elections, or in politics. Each individual priest is entitled to his personal opinion in politics and to his vote in elections. But he is forbidden by the Church to participate in an electioneering campaign; he cannot openly be a member of a political party; and he cannot use the pulpit for politics. Voters may ask advice from the priests if they so wish; but generally the priest's answer will be, "Vote as your conscience dictates, or, vote for the man you consider the more honest."

Such an answer is "moral," not political, and it is quite correct; if any man is entitled to talk "morals" that man is certainly the priest. There is another side to the problem. A priest who has studied theology, ethics, sociology, political science, who graduated in these subjects and teaches them, has a special competence and authority to discuss such matters and to give his opinion. He speaks as a specialist rather than as a priest; his sayings may be examined and discussed and refuted if necessary. This was true of the two gentlemen I have mentioned. Their statement echoed all the bishops and Popes; nay, it was the echo of the ancient Athenians, particularly of Plato, who complained that the Greek cities were selling their suffrage in order to get a harbour or a wall and in so doing were ruining the democratic ideal.

Yet the incident immediately stirred up opinion in Quebec; associations sprang up with the purpose of educating the common people, of

teaching democracy. They were not the first, however, and we should mention the Institut Démocratique, established in Montreal some ten years ago by the Honourable T. D. Bouchard, member of the Canadian Senate. Both lectures and a periodical were used by the Institut to give the people a better knowledge of democracy.

All these efforts are commendable; they have already accomplished good work. To go further we should have in the schools a course on civics, government, and allied subjects. Yet such work will do little to reconcile the French Canadians to the idea of democracy. It is certainly as wrong to give or sell votes in order to get a road, a bridge, a school, or a hospital, as it was wrong two thousand years ago to sell votes for a harbour or a wall, and it will not be difficult to persuade a French Canadian that such things are wrong, are an abuse of democracy. But we must go deeper into his conscience, his national conscience. His heritage itself has been wronged across the years by majorities using their weight to kill French culture. It was wrong to expel the Acadians from their properties, and nothing has ever been done to compensate them. It was wrong to limit, in provinces other than Quebec, the teaching of French to the eye-drop measure, and little or nothing has been done to redress that situation. Many such instances are remembered by French Canadians. They know that these wrongs have been carried out under cover of democracy, by the rule of the majority. Weight of numbers has triumphed over right.

"Je me souviens." They remember. The year 1867 was supposed to be the opening of an era of equality; in fact it has been quite the reverse. Why then should French Canadians feel enthusiastic towards a system that appears to them organized injustice? They always resent being thought of as a minority. They do not accept minority status. They want equality. If equality is impossible, what is to be done? The idea of separation comes immediately to mind; of an independent French state, a republic like Ireland or India or Pakistan, or even Ghana. There are groups working on such schemes. Will they triumph? The answer is in the hands of the non-French Canadians: they may kill forever the idea of democracy unless they make it the expression of equality between the two groups.

NOTES

1 Jérome Demers, *Institutiones philosophicae ad usum studiosae juventutis* (Quebec, 1835).

2 M. E. Geruzez, *Nouveau Cours de philosophie* (Paris, 1833).

POLITICAL PARTIES IN QUEBEC

Gérard Bergeron

Almost nothing has been written on this subject. M. Ostrogorski and R. Michels, have had, in contemporary political science, but late disciples. In Canada, the "party" phenomenon has received only a few chapters of rapid summary in textbooks such as those of Dawson and Corry, or historical monographs of the type of those by Morton, Mallory, and Williams.[1] All this constitutes a mass of useful information, but nothing which resembles an analytical framework to which one might usefully refer for specific studies of our parties.

Since 1950, French Canada, ordinarily circumscribed by its provincial frontiers, has become the subject of various essays classified under the title of "industrialisation in Quebec" or "the crisis of French Canada's conscience."[2] But it is already significant that none of these essayists has been tempted to centre his view on the phenomenon "political parties." Making a rather "impressionistic" or intuitive study of the undercurrents of a society no longer stable in appearance, few of these essayists have had a scientific and analytical approach in studying a social condition which, at the same time as it integrates them, makes them manifestly dissatisfied. Whoever is concerned with political parties in Quebec starts off absolutely from zero.

I

The Union Nationale party gives the impression of having invincible strength. Except for an interval between 1939 and 1944, it has been in power since 1936. With his new victory in 1956, M. Duplessis has beaten successively all the records of the other "strong man," M. Taschereau, whom he defeated in 1936. The last twenty years reveal a parallel continuance of Liberal successes in Ottawa (the Quebec vote in the federal election of 1957 remained faithful to the Liberals, though a little less

than in the past) and conservative successes in Quebec. In terms of electoral statistics the federal Liberal hold in Quebec has always been much stronger than the provincial conservative one. Since 1944, M. Duplessis' party has won an absolute majority of votes: 1948, 51 per cent; 1952, 50 per cent; 1956, 52 per cent. In 1944, it secured a minority of votes although it had a majority of seats in parliament (38 per cent and 45 seats as against 47 per cent and 37 Liberal seats). The great stability of these majorities is striking. But a very weak numerical majority is involved especially if one takes into consideration the negligible power—except in 1944—of the third parties. (We are not concerned here with showing the distortions arising from the single-ballot uninominal voting and the sub-representation of urban ridings: such a situation is not characteristic of Quebec alone. But it must be pointed out, once and for all, that the 75 or 80 per cent of parliamentary seats held by M. Duplessis' party should not delude us; since 1948 they have been supported by only about 50 per cent of the popular vote.) The strength of the Union Nationale is marginal: with the exception of about 4 or 5 per cent of the votes, which go to Independents or third parties, the Liberals receive almost as many votes as does M. Duplessis' party. This fine majority is insecure.

The contradictory voting in Quebec and in Ottawa is often explained by the desire of the French Canadians to reach a federative balance between federal and provincial allegiances. This is too simple and too brief an explanation; it is also too ingenious and too clever, since such an explanation would presuppose at least a summary knowledge of the play of federative balance and therefore a minimum of political maturity. In my opinion, it is a clear but unsound idea arising from an *a posteriori* rationalization. Because of the ideological vacuity of our politics, such a rational explanation seems artificial.

Quebec electors vote according to a reflex, which in the last twenty years has become conditioned. This primary reflex is not a desire to effect a balance within the Canadian federation or a desire to achieve autonomy, which would be its essential corollary and its immediate political application, but indeed *conservatism*. "Why change, since, on the whole, things are going well!"

At the turning point of 1935–6 the Quebec people had a single change-reflex which manifested itself bilaterally: on the federal level by the support, in 1935, of Liberal promises against the inability of the Bennett régime to offset the effects of the great depression; and, in 1936, on the provincial level by the rejection of the Liberal régime, which was not so

much rotten and corrupt as it was peculiarly superseded by events at a time when new powers were dawning on the horizon. But for the last twenty years, Quebec (not counting the ambiguous provincial election of 1939 because of the "conscription" issue) has voted for the *status quo*. And it will do so indefinitely, unless a sharp stomach ache forces it to take a corrective remedy.

But Quebec, voting in the last twenty years, in federal and provincial elections, for the *status quo* is, by the same token, involved in the play of opposition between the provincial governments and the Liberal government of Ottawa (at least up until June 1957) which seems to be one of the major principles of balance in the Canadian federation.[3] In the province of Quebec the importance of this phenomenon tends to be exaggerated and simplified because of M. Duplessis' personal rôle.

It is claimed that the provinces are not satisfied with Ottawa, particularly in respect to fiscal agreements. The mistake consists in supposing this pretext to be their driving force. Such a force arises from a twofold fact: (1) to the extent that the Liberal party was nationally strong, the provincial legislatures set up non-Liberal or anti-Liberal governments, with strictly provincial or regional functions; (2) our electoral system, which is as absurd in the provinces as it is in Ottawa, reduced to insignificance itself the oppositions in the legislatures. Let us consider in turn each of these two factors.

British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan are administered by third parties which preserve a melancholy memory of their past radicalism (this is a little less true with regard to the party of Mr. Douglas). Since the time of Hepburn and Godbout, Ontario and Quebec have been in a full era of conservatism. Nova Scotia, after twenty-three years of a Liberal régime, has just become converted to conservatism, as was its Atlantic sister New Brunswick in 1952. What legislatures still have liberal leanings? Prince Edward Island which is a great rural municipality indulging in the luxury of being a province; Newfoundland whose political umbilical cord has not yet been severed from its Ottawa mother; Manitoba where a regional government contrasts strongly with its dynamic neighbours to right and left. Mathematically these amount to about 1/15 of the Canadian population.

Seven provinces out of ten, or 14/15 of the Canadian population, split politically when they vote in provincial elections. It is as if the Canadian electorate led a double life. This is probably a healthy situation; at any rate it exists. It provides a strong opposition between the central government and the provinces. But this opposition expresses itself

on the level of fiscal agreements! Of course, but "There's more than that, young man." Provincial governments represent local solidarities and interests. This is what they are there for.

No national political programme, precisely because it is national, can suit all regions. Furthermore, it is impossible to set up a political programme which combines at the same time an universal and a pluralist nature. As a result the provincial governments, having continually to make representations at Ottawa for any reason or case whatsoever, are always in a state of virtual or actual tension with the central government; and they make themselves heard all the more easily if they have no party affiliation with the federal Liberals. What caused the continued success of the latter also caused a corresponding weakness in the provincial Liberals. Quebec is a good case in point, even though its Liberal leadership has not taken up till now any practical consequences from the situation.

Let us pass on to the second factor which I set out above. There is, at the present time, a pronounced lack of parliamentary opposition in provincial legislatures. The situation is all the more serious in that numbers are smaller. In Ottawa a total Opposition of 60 to 75 members is too weak. Provincial legislatures have only token Oppositions: 4 or 5 members.

At present in Quebec, the Liberals, as a result of the recent by-elections and two withdrawals, have only 17 members to oppose the compact group of M. Duplessis. The case of Ontario is worse: 83 Conservatives against 13 in Opposition. British Columbia: 39 against 12; Newfoundland: 32 against 4. In New Brunswick (37 against 15) and Alberta (37 against 24) the lack of balance is less marked. Nova Scotia alone has a balanced parliament: 23 against 20.

This is not a recent fact. Eight years ago the situation was worse. In the ten provincial legislatures there were then only 89 Opposition members (an average of 9 per province) facing 446 supporters of the Governments. That is a ratio of one Opposition to five Government members.[4]

From the point of view of the opposition between the central government and the provinces, there ensues this flagrant consequence: that the excess of power (which is the political energy) of most of the provincial governments must find an outlet somewhere else. This is the "foreign policy" of the provinces, and of Canadians, above all and everywhere in Canada, great provincialists. The net result is often inefficiency, stagnation, corruption. And if the provincial prime minister should have an *ancien régime* temperament, virtual dictatorship follows. Dictators, hav-

ing suppressed or rendered fictitious any internal opposition, need an outside scapegoat, which serves to hide the deficiencies and failures of their home politics. Most provincial governments have found one: Ottawa. For the great majority of Canadians that is the only "foreign policy" which they understand.

And so, it is comprehensible that the majority of the provincial prime ministers took active part in the last federal election; yet the master of them all, M. Duplessis, stayed right at home. This proves his superiority! His prestige within his own province remained intact. He merely allowed some of his liegemen to "settle accounts." (During the provincial election of 1956, federal opponents had even entered the struggle against certain Union Nationale candidates.) One can even attribute to M. Duplessis' electoral machine some of the rare gains which the Conservative party made in Quebec in the federal election of June 10, 1957.

II

Having situated in its pan-Canadian setting the interplay of Quebec political parties, we must now restrict our study to their provincial limits.

The Union Nationale is a man without a party. This is its strength and its weakness. The provincial Liberals constitute a party without a man. That is their weakness without being their strength.

Among the provincial conservatives an aggregate of interests serves as a substitute for the party. To be accurate, one must make clear that it is not solely a question of flatly material interests; think for example of the number of those who are rallied by M. Duplessis' verbal and ineffectual "autonomisme" which transcends, in their minds, the most blatant defects of the régime.

Among the provincial Liberals, one finds all the elements of a party. There is a faithful rank and file which has theoretically the means of putting the party into power. There are certain traditional values which, even though they may not be lofty and are shackled by the ball and chain of a weighty past, survive in spite of everything, and can give rise freely to a dynamism which has been up till now insufficiently or sadly used. But this party lacks men. (My viewpoint here is far broader than one which would merely involve the official leadership or the personality of M. Lapalme, whether or not the latter remains the nominal or effective leader of the party.) Now, there is no substitute for men.

M. Duplessis is the Union Nationale and *vice versa*. But what is M. Duplessis himself? He is a "boss." And I hasten to add, lest this narrow

our conceptions, he is an autocrat, or, if you wish, a "sincere boss." He is not an autocrat-through-efficiency, as Mr. C. D. Howe was; he is a convinced autocrat. He loves, seeks, wants to be what is strong. He is an *ancien régime* personality, who believes honestly that the established order, because it is established, is good and must last. He has an hierarchical conception of the social order: everything which tends to egalitarian or at least social advancement, makes him feel ill at ease, as if it were something which goes against the natural order of things. His anti-trade-unionism, which causes him to take great risks, does not stem from a faith in capitalism or in the virtues of free enterprise, but indeed from a rejection of the idea that a social group might seek to exert a political influence greater than its economic strength. For him, democracy is a means of selecting a strong political species, rather than a rule of fair play and a measure of protection for the weak. The strong man is the successful man. M. Duplessis' prototype is the great capitalist business man whom he admires, not because of his riches, but because of his power.

He is feared, first of all by his chief lieutenants from whom he does not hide that they are what they are because of him: this creates bonds of fidelity of a special nature. He has been able to render ineffective all opposition, including the Liberal opposition which suffers obviously from an inferiority complex. Since 1948 he has reduced parliamentary procedure to a hollow pretence. There would be ample cause for ten pipe-line debates at each session of the Quebec legislature. The great scandal is not that such types of debate have not taken place, but that an entire population should not be scandalized by the fact.

M. Duplessis is a colourful personality. He does not play the part of a *grand seigneur* like his predecessor, M. Taschereau. He was able, at the outset of his first victories, to fashion for himself an unaffected language and a personality which not only tolerated but invited a certain affectionate familiarity: "Maurice," people call him. With age he has become somewhat pompous. He sermonizes. One could assemble a delectable collection of his Joseph Prud'homme epigrams: "The best land is the human mind"; "The best health-insurance is health." He professes the cult of hard work and sets himself up as an example.

These broad outlines of too brief a sketch point out that M. Duplessis' bold originality is in keeping with his sustained successes. His supreme skill consists of keeping in tune with the nationalistic sentiments of his compatriots while pursuing at the same time an anti-nationalistic policy (cf. his participation with great foreign capital in the development of

natural resources, the absence of any coherent and progressive policy in matters of education—which is however culturally vital for French Canadians). He knows how to sound skilfully the chord of clericalism and anti-communism; and in this respect, following a technique which has proven effective elsewhere, he does not shrink before the "big lie": Abitibi machine guns, Polish treasures, communist sabotage of the Three Rivers bridge. He realizes the binding power of gold chains and is adroit at using public subsidies. In his initial alliances, he has got the best of all those who were instrumental in his first successes.

The power which he holds is both simple and complex. He is informed about everything; he decides everything; he does not trust his collaborators, even though they may be of cabinet rank. A session of the Quebec legislature takes on easily the appearance of a one-man show. The electoral outcome indicates to what extent such a régime can produce at the opportune moment "L'attraction de la plus grande force." This phenomenon was clearly perceptible during the 1956 elections, to such an extent that the magnitude of the means used in that instance produced a widespread though ephemeral reaction, crystallized around the letter of the Abbés Dion and O'Neil, which made headlines in Canadian papers and many foreign reviews.

But he is a courageous man, and on occasion stubborn. He knows how to retreat and let people forget (there were no press conferences for several weeks after the Dion-O'Neil affair), but he never gives in. I believe his politics to be fundamentally and generally bad for the people of Quebec; but I have no reason to doubt his good faith. With all his faults, he embodies, to the point of being a prototype, the defects of a purely formal and demagogic democracy, but also the state of political immaturity of too great a part of the Quebec population, of which it has been said that it had nothing but feelings. One can subscribe only in part to the following lines of J. B. McGeachy:

> He represents, as probably no other politician has ever done since the days of the late Henri Bourassa, the determination of the French-Canadians to remain themselves and to preserve, in the heart of North America, their special and distinctive culture, their faith and language, their reverence for the family as the proper source of instruction and compassion, their Gallic high spirits and gaiety, their belief that the material rewards of this mundane life are as nothing compared with spiritual grace, their attachment to ancestral acres and houses.
>
> Mr. Duplessis represents all this but he does so, let it be noted, less militantly than he did in the late 1930s when this correspondent met him as a comparatively young politician flushed with success, rambunctious in his social behavior, self-confident to the point of arrogance.[5]

I have preferred to point out some aspects of M. Duplessis rather than attempt to analyse the electoral and administrative machine he has created. We can see quite easily the results of its operation though its mechanism may be hidden. It is undoubtedly the wealthiest and most thorough that Canada has ever known.[6] In more than one respect the "bossism" of M. Duplessis offers remarkable analogies with other experiments in America: mythical anti-communism and militant anti-trade-unionism, subsidized public works (hospitals, bridges, and schools) all inaugurated with great public fanfare—as under Hague in New Jersey; apparent democratic forms and great declarations of civic faith, control over provincial employees and the police, almost complete destruction of parliamentary liberties—as under Long in Louisiana; various restrictions placed upon election proceedings—as under Pendergast in Kansas City; handling of patronage with sufficient subtlety so as to reduce or hide incidents likely to make the régime unpopular—as under Murphy and Flynn at Tammany Hall, Byrd in Virginia, or Dewey in the state of New York. It is astonishing that the majorities of the Union Nationale are not larger and that its political hold is not stronger. There is no doubt, in this respect, a factor to be taken into account: space. Relatively small though it be, the population of Quebec is spread over a territory much vaster than a great municipality or an American state. There is also the integration into a federative constitutional system which prevents this autocracy from becoming something more than a virtual dictatorship restricted to certain levels of public life.

III

The Union Nationale, as I have stated above, is a man without a party. This seems to imply that when M. Duplessis disappears there will no longer be a Union Nationale. This is a mistaken idea: the non-dynastic transmission of power in such a system does not take place smoothly; but nothing prevents us from thinking that a new Duplessis, with a possibly less openly autocratic temperament, will rise, and inherit followers who believe confusedly but practically in political autocracy and in social "statism" as values desirable in themselves.

Those who think that the fate of provincial Conservatives is linked with the state of health or the political longevity of M. Duplessis confuse two things: the precariousness of too strong a personal power and the broad ideological and social conditions which are not only the basis of the success of this personal power, but also the justification of its very

abuses. In other words, "duplessisme," whatever superficially altered form it may assume, will survive its original, because it expresses remarkably well an essential social tendency of our Quebec *milieu*: a tendency towards a static autocracy, combining vague theocratic and nationalistic elements, in which the exploitation of the myths—in their Quebec versions—of autonomism and anti-communism is politically profitable.

The Liberals, in this respect, are in a position of obvious inferiority: they are not, or do not appear, sufficiently different from "duplessistes" who have, furthermore, brought to an exemplary degree of efficiency, in another context, the "gouinism" or "taschereauism" of the past. Those who are more than forty will at least remember the latter. To counter the inevitable statism, inherent in "duplessisme," the Liberals are not committing themselves with sufficient firmness to the cause of social and political reform, which is no less essential and quantitatively important.

An elementary law of political success is simplification: one must be white or black, for or against, for the ayes or for the no's, beloved or hated. Since 1948 the provincial Liberals have appeared in a rather greyish light where the for and the aye are confused with the against and the no, and this situation wins them merely feelings of vague sympathy involving neither very firm decisions nor irrevocable support. Before they can effectively exploit their proper sphere of activity the Liberals must first take stock of their ideology themselves and then show clearly where they stand.

Rarely has a political party been so substantially strong and yet given such an impression of weakness. Its primary source of strength is to be itself and to be able, from the outset, without the need for organization or propaganda, to count on about 700,000 voters, that is, approximately 40 per cent of the active electorate. Our parliamentary system of elections, our political customs, and the coincidence of relative prosperity, are combined in such a way as to imprison us in the straight jacket of a two-party system. In the far-foreseeable future, two parties only are biologically possible: beyond them everything is but melancholy romanticism, which beckons those dedicated to frustration. Not only is this party predominant in the Opposition; it is the whole Opposition. Yet the Opposition such as it is, is not made up of 20 members against 73, but of 47 per cent in Opposition against 52 per cent: that is the measure of its true stature.

This numerical strength, which, more than its own merits, ensures the party a monopoly in the Opposition, is rather passive, formless, capricious; witness the 2 per cent of "Liberals" who voted for Duplessis in

June 1957. But such a massive electorate, entirely devoted, is a power that must be taken into account in all Liberal plans for the future. If we recall the 40 per cent of Liberal votes in the defeat of 1944, the 36.5 per cent in the collapse of 1948, if we do not forget the upward swing of 1952 with 46 per cent (even though the last election has shown a downward trend of about 1.5 per cent) we will understand why I have estimated at 40 per cent the present vote that the Liberals can count on. There is nothing catastrophic in this temporary stagnation—any living organism runs the risk of going through such phases. What is dangerous, even fatal, is the risk of chronic stagnation, whether it is accepted or not.

One can blame the spell of "duplessisme," which has always made capital out of the ambient political amorality which permeates our "Catholic province." But if the Liberals have stagnated for a few elections, it is because their traditional electoral methods have reached a saturation point. Stunned since the blow of June 20, 1956, nothing shows, from the outside, whether they are in the process of recuperating. Like a punch-drunk boxer, they seem unable to co-ordinate their efforts. They are more aware of the obstacle which confronts them than of their power to overcome it. And above all, they do not yet seem convinced that one does not fight "duplessisme" with the same weapons which give it, at the outset, an advantage of five to one.

The opportunity is given the Liberal party to settle two of its important problems: (1) the equivocal tutelage of the federal Liberals; (2) its great poverty. If all political differences are somehow resolved in compromise it does not follow that the compromise must always be settled in an equivocal atmosphere. When M. Lapalme strongly takes sides on the question of natural resources what confidence can he enlist when the opposite camp replies that Messrs St. Laurent and Howe believe that M. Duplessis has struck a good bargain? When M. Lapalme proclaims his future freedom of action in matters of fiscal problems, he hears Messrs Lapointe, Lesage and Pinard say, "We are on your side, M. Lapalme!" At the same time when M. Lapalme is concentrating his efforts on the level of local organization, he does not even know how many organizations of federal members are going to compromise with the "duplessistes" against his own candidates. How can one act freely under the threat of such fratricidal dagger thrusts?

The dilemma will be solved when the provincial Liberals clearly free themselves from the tutelage, harmful and opposed to their aims, of their Ottawa brethren. One day the provincial conservative party, which amounted to nothing, became something, by concentrating its activities

on the provincial level (I overlook all the hypocritical imposture of this demagogic provincialism, turning in a vicious circle); why should the Quebec Liberal party, which has an identity of its own, not become a party fulfilling an open and operative "provincial function?" It need only have the courage to seek rebirth by the integration of those vivifying elements which are available but which it lacks; they await only a sign of friendship and the assurance of unreserved hospitality.

Secondly, and even more important: the provincial Liberal party is poor, in the face of the rich Duplessis organization and is content to derive a title to glory from its poverty. This is a healthy state of affairs, of course, but it might be politically exploited. The party also bears a heavy burden in its dependency on 5 or 10 big subscribers to its treasury. Because of them, it is still in a rut. To democratize a party it is not enough to superimpose upon it a federative structure, to invent a pyramidal organization reaching to the very centre of the parish or the ward, to institute a system of dues from militant party-members. All this can even invite suspicion, if one does not feel the life-blood pulsating within. A straightforward game must be played.

The existence of the Fédération Libérale Provinciale has been up until now but a high-sounding promise and not a mechanism of political efficiency, or a training ground for the democratization of the ranks, which are given so much importance. The Fédération must be the whole party, its organization, its administration, its framework, if it is not to be a burden to the party.

Under present conditions a radical step should be taken: either destroy or build up the Fédération in order that it may be neither a false representation nor an impediment to action. Therein lies the hope of the party's self-financing, which would allow a sufficient freedom of action with respect to federal aid and important subscribers to its coffers. Can the federated subscribers supply the party treasury with sufficient funds? At the present time it is estimated that the Fédération has 35,000 members paying dues of two dollars. There is no exaggeration in thinking that the least aggressive campaign would triple its numbers in twelve months: 100,000 members giving an average of ten dollars (a minimum of $2 and a maximum of $100) would produce 1 million dollars, or 4 millions in 4 years! Out of 700,000 Liberal voters is it far-fetched to anticipate that at least 100,000 would contribute?

Going still more deeply into the question, one can see that the problem is not a simple one. The Liberal party needs young social and intellectual

teams to carry on its work of self-democratization. Now these remain on the fringe not only of the Liberal party but of politics. And the greatest admission of weakness on the part of the Liberals is not that they have been constantly bested by the shrewdest politician in our history, but that they have allowed organizations of young intellectuals to be formed on the fringes of their party without giving them a forum and the political weapons to carry out a successful battle. It is a vicious circle. What is involved is not only the shortcomings of a party, but also the cultural phenomenon of the devaluation of politics in French Canada. At the end of the war a new generation of Quebec young people became aware of the very rapid transformation of their society by industrialization and urbanization. They became active in social and trade-union movements, journalism, and university teaching. The federal administration, diplomacy, the C.B.C., the National Film Board, the legal profession, offered in greater numbers than ever before outlets which were less subject to the various risks of political life, and this at the height of the Duplessis era. The result is undeniable: young people, of whom a certain number, in days gone by, would have chosen a political career, found themselves engaged in professions in which they were led to act according to a social or cultural order of priority. Politics offered no incentive. The problems of the Liberals are basically those of an absentee political generation.

In the last year or two we have witnessed a still-diffident return to politics. People show a tendency, in various sectors, to group themselves for a still indeterminate political action, but aiming at a democratization of public life in Quebec. That is the goal of certain movements such as the Rassemblement and the Ligues de Moralité. Trade-unions are once again becoming more aggressive in their political action as a result of recent labour conflicts in the province of Quebec. But this question would require a separate paper to discuss it. As for the Liberals themselves, the game is not lost. One of the bitterest critics of the "old guard" characteristics still shown by the Liberals at large, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, could not refrain from stating,

> And yet I cannot help admiring the tenacity of the small group of men who set out to infuse some democratic blood into the veins of a party which has never been anything more than a syndicate of private interests. . . . But inasmuch as they have accepted the Liberal challenge it is only right that they should now play the game to the end. And one must recognize that, in this death struggle, they have not lost the first innings. The Liberal machine, I mean the coterie of finance and reaction, has not succeeded in destroying the *Fédération*.[7]

Another independent observer, Lorenzo Paré, wrote at the same time:

> The Liberals of Quebec do not need to hide behind a mask. They can convert their present setbacks into factors of strength.
>
> For example, the Liberal ranks suffer from the defection of certain professional classes, from which our career politicians have always been recruited. So much the better, if they prefer the fruits of power to the duties of political action: the field of parliamentary representation and the meaning of our democracy will be thereby expanded.
>
> So much the better if the young and the intellectuals are showing signs of impatience: their presence and their influence will be welcomed all the more in the bosom of the different parties. On the other hand the intellectuals and young people must realize that they are dedicating themselves to powerlessness—by dissociating themselves from the mass of the citizenry—if they refuse to unite with the traditional parties and give life to these common denominators of the whole nation.[8]

IV

The collapse of the Bloc Populaire Canadien has confirmed the failure not only of a nationalist party but of a third party in the province of Quebec. The tradition of these ephemeral parties, born of circumstances and disappearing with them, is a long one. In 1872 a national movement was brought into existence by the Indian affairs in the West and the controversy over the schools of New Brunswick; in 1885, Honoré Mercier received almost complete support for his national movement set up to protest the execution of Riel; the nationalist movement of 1911 was a reaction of young Liberals, led by Henri Bourassa, against the supposedly imperialistic politics of Laurier; in 1935, a similar reaction of the young Liberals manifested itself, with the creation of the Action Libérale Nationale, against the provincial leadership of Taschereau. In 1877 and 1911 these movements exerted their influence chiefly on the federal level, but the movements led by Honoré Mercier and his grandson, Paul Gouin, were provincial ones.

These political movements have features in common: they were born as the result of a split on a question of principle, and the dissident elements in the major party—Conservative until 1900—temporarily allied themselves with the other party which contributed both personnel and finance. It was the better organized and wealthier party which absorbed the other, once the temporary battle was over. It is thus that the puny conservative party of M. Duplessis became the powerful Union Nationale, as a result of its alliance with the young and dynamic Action Libérale Nationale. The genius of M. Duplessis has succeeded in maintaining this

double imposture of a régime born of nationalism and social reform which is, at the same time, undoubtedly the most anti-nationalistic and most reactionary in the Western world.

The originality of the Bloc Populaire Canadien springs from the fact that it was born not as a result of the dissidence of a wing breaking away from the traditional party, but thanks to a group of men who, for the most part, were not practising politicians. But, like the other movements, it was created under the pressure of circumstances (plebiscite and threat of conscription) which it did not long survive. Furthermore, it wanted to preserve its identity in the face of the two traditional parties. As for the ideology which inspired it, one could find in it quite incoherent, not to say contradictory, elements. But it is only right to stress that the Bloc Populaire, just like the Action Libérale Nationale, was essentially a reform movement, centred on the awareness of national problems. Both of these parties hoped that their early nationalism would be changed into a programme of social reform, which was incidentally tinged with a certain radicalism.[9]

Since the collapse of the Bloc Populaire Canadien, Quebec has been a barren land for third parties. The C.C.F., whose Quebec branch has recently been called, in European style, Parti Social Démocrate, has never been able to gain a serious foothold in Quebec. Thanks to a proliferation of candidates, it was able to get one member elected in Abitibi county a few years ago. It does not usually present candidates outside the metropolitan area of Montreal and a few other urban counties. In 1952, it received 1 per cent of the popular vote but in 1956 the vote dropped to 0.5 per cent. This party would seem to be the preferred party of the younger generation, of social and trade-union groups, of social-nationalists. But as it is destined to impotence on the Quebec scene (because of its foreign and socialistic origins), it enlists more passive sympathy than active support. At this juncture, we reach an apparent paradox: the survivors of the Action Libérale Nationale and the Bloc Populaire teams themselves admit that nationalism could not be the keystone of a third group, but it is precisely the inability of the Parti Social Démocrate to don a provincial guise which makes it unacceptable in Quebec. Which brings us back to the option offered by the Liberals.[10]

Here once more we find the fundamental problems mentioned above. This party has always maintained a radical wing and a tradition of free discussion. This suffices to give the party a certain viability, but does not however endow it with the power to attract the young *élite* which it still lacks.

A part of this young *élite* is at present united to the recent movement of the Rassemblement, which defines itself as a movement for education and democratic action. The confused circumstances which have surrounded the birth and the short history of this group do not allow us to say in which direction it will evolve, nor even if it will continue to live. Its originality consists in an effort to enter independently into provincial politics. But in this connection there are smaller groups which are exceptions: the members of the Parti Social Démocrate have already made their choice and have been welcomed. Their interest in the Rassemblement stems from the desire to have more elbow-room: they seek natural allies. They also conceal poorly the fear of being one day swallowed up. Certain people who have never been active in the Liberal ranks, believe that only a difficult though not impossible revival in the Liberal party can bring about any lasting change whatsoever. Finally, others are vaguely awaiting something yet undefined to take place, possibly within the Rassemblement itself. By these last two categories, it is thought that the P.S.D. is still-born, and to them this means wider opportunity.

The typical "rassemblé" is a man in his thirties who went through the depression as a child and the war as an adolescent. As soon as he reached mature age, about ten years ago, he became engaged in social action, usually trade-unionism, as a result of which he has developed a keen social consciousness which has rebelled more than once against the unbelievable political mediocrity of the *milieu*. "Duplessisme" sickens him and the Liberals, who have disappointed him, do not appeal to him in the least. He would not be French Canadian if he had not inherited a deep scorn for petty politics (*politicaillerie*) which generations have handed down to him. Today he is awakening politically: in the post-war years, he gave importance first and foremost to social progress, adapting his own conduct to it; but in the heat of battle he became progressively aware that any social problem is posed initially and is finally resolved in politics. But how is he to act politically? Two important groups exist and are possible and he rejects them almost without distinguishing between them. Others have a marginal or symbolic existence, such as the Parti Social Démocrate. Politically, he is a worried, bitter, aimless man. The social force which he represents has no political expression. It operates in a vacuum.

If asked in what direction the Rassemblement will evolve, the answer would have to take into account the immediate political choice which will be made by the younger generation, which feels the need to join once again a political party. It seems to this author that the democrat-

ization of the Liberal party is a less difficult task than the creation of a third power, whether or not the Parti Social Démocrate or the Rassemblement be its nucleus.[11]

The evolution of "duplessisme" itself also entails an unknown factor. M. Duplessis' anti-labour politics prompted a new reaction from union leaders during the 1957 strikes. At the time of the Murdochville strike, M. Gérard Pinard, president of the C.T.C.C. (C.C.C.L.), stated during a public meeting:

> After all that has taken place in our province, it is not surprising if the workers are now thinking of a political move to have their rights respected. And we shall use every means available to us, to bring about a victory for the workers.
>
> In a democracy, the three powers: executive, legislative, and judiciary, are entrusted to different hands, but here in Quebec one man holds these powers, M. Duplessis, who makes laws and then decides whether they are to apply in such-and-such a case. This form of government is much more dangerous than a dictatorship because its leader would have us believe that it is a democracy whereas it is a true dictatorship.
>
> It has been said that people have the government they deserve. We have a rotten government and I believe it is time to undertake a justified and conclusive battle.
>
> The battle we are waging will be won in the streets and this day I ask all our intellectuals and our clergy to take the necessary steps to participate in this struggle and go down into the streets with us, in order that justice and the freedom of the workers be respected.[12]

Mr. Roger Provost, president of the Quebec Federation of Workers, which for a long time gave the impression of being on the best of terms with M. Duplessis, despite his anti-labour policies, stated at the same time:

> We must recapture once again the driving spirit of the pioneers and this time, since the enemy of the working class hides behind political parties which it fattens all the better to overwhelm us, we shall have to supplant the political party.
>
> Workers, what is the use of our victories, our struggles in the picket lines, as long as we elect governments controlled by bosses who, with a stroke of the pen, or by an administrative decree, can wipe out in one sweep all our past gains.
>
> There is only one place where we shall win the right of association in this province and that is in the parliament of Quebec.[13]

These are new voices since the famous Asbestos strike of 1949. But three years later the Union Nationale once again elected 70 members in a house of 93 seats. . . .

NOTES

1 W. L. Morton, *The Progressive Party in Canada* (Toronto, 1950); J. R. Mallory, *Social Credit and the Federal Power in Canada* (Toronto, 1954); John R. Williams, *The Conservative Party of Canada 1930–1949* (Durham, North Carolina, 1956).

2 Let us mention the special edition of the French periodical *Esprit* on "French Canada," August-September 1952; *Essais sur le Québec contemporain*, ed. Jean-C. Falardeau (Quebec, 1953); *La Grève de l'amiante*, ed. Pierre Elliott Trudeau (Montreal, 1956).

3 The other three principles would be: (1) the various balances *within the parties*, including their masses of inertia: opposition of the five geographic and economic regions; opposition of two ethnic groups; opposition of age groups—the "young bloods" and the "old fogies"; opposition of material and professional interests—farmers, workmen, professional people, white collars, "capitalists," industrialists and shop-keepers, trade-unionists, people with private means, etc.; (2) the *civil service*, in which the weight, the esprit de corps tradition, and the required qualifications lead not only to bureaucratic excesses but also to the control of the government by the civil service; (3) *public opinion* which can express itself or be led to express itself, through the means of communication, in associations which represent party interests and propaganda.

4 Cf. Miller Stewart, "Do Canadians Hold Opposition Cheap?" *Canadian Forum* (September 1952).

5 *Financial Post*, April 6, 1957.

6 In a period of elections, the expenses of the Union Nationale for publicity in newspapers and on the radio and television far exceed those of the two national parties during a federal election.

7 *Vrai*, Montreal, November 3, 1956.

8 *L'Action Catholique*, reprinted in *La Réforme*, November 14, 1956.

9 This is especially true for the A.L.N. (e.g., its fight against trusts, chiefly that of electrical power).

10 We leave aside the Labour-Progressive party which, in Quebec, more than anywhere else is a negligible entity; also, two psycho-pathological political phenomena, the fascism of Adrien Arcand, of which the "duplessistes" make use on occasion, and the creditists, who have dissolved their party and continue to exist under the name of Union des Electeurs whose "congregational" character offers colourful, not to say ridiculous, features: a group which has done some harm to the Liberals, who had integrated them into their *Front Uni* during the campaign of 1956.

11 We have not spoken of the "ligues de moralité" which, except in Montreal, are movements of civic education. The Ligue d'Action Civique in Montreal supported Mayor Drapeau and a group of councillors, and carries on as a municipal party. But since its defeat, ex-Mayor Drapeau is a political unknown, as far as provincial politics are concerned. Several other leagues have swarmed in the province especially as a result of the publicity surrounding the declaration of Abbés Dion and O'Neil in the summer of 1956.

12 *Le Devoir*, August 26, 1957.

13 *Le Soleil*, August 17, 1957.

THE TRADE-UNION MOVEMENT IN QUEBEC

Gérard Dion

Out of a wage-earning population in the province of Quebec of 1,500,000, about 316,000 workers belong to unions.[1] This proportion is approximately the same as that found in the other industrialized provinces of Canada.

The Quebec labour movement comprises two bodies: the Canadian and Catholic Confederation of Labour, which, despite its name and character, is almost exclusively limited to the province of Quebec, and the Quebec Federation of Labour, affiliated with the Canadian Labour Congress. Of the two, the Quebec Federation of Labour has more members: nearly two-thirds of the unionized workers are said to belong to it.

Because trade-unionism is essentially a popular movement, it is natural that it should reflect in some ways the character of the population in a given area, as well as the problems found there. One is thus not surprised to discover that the labour movement in the province of Quebec possesses, along with some features common to trade-unionism in other Canadian provinces, certain special characteristics; furthermore, it faces certain unique difficulties.

The province of Quebec undoubtedly has a population with a quite distinctive culture, history, and tradition. In one respect or another the French and Roman Catholic characteristics of the province could not fail to have repercussions on the development and attitudes of the labour movement there.

By granting to the provinces a broad area of jurisdiction in the field of labour relations, the Canadian constitution has created a unique juridical setting for subsequent union activity. A number of unusual measures, coupled with the specialized orientation of those responsible for administering labour legislation, tend to give a distinctive stamp to union organization and policies, and even to the spirit of their leaders and members. Furthermore, the degree of industrialization, the size of businesses, and the employers' attitude towards unions give a specific colouring to trade-

unionism in any setting. All these factors taken together create a frame of reference which has brought into existence in the province of Quebec an original union movement likely to develop in somewhat different fashion from that which can be observed in the other Canadian provinces.

The present article is devoid of scientific pretensions and does not seek to examine in any thorough way Quebec trade-unionism and all its problems: it proposes instead to limit its critical examination to a particular moment in the development of the labour movement in the province. It is our contention that for reasons which are both external and internal Quebec unionism is passing through what may be the most critical period of its history.

One must not, however, dramatize the situation unduly. The labour movement is established in the province of Quebec with every indication of permanence. There is no doubt that its achievements in the matter of professional standards and its advances in the area of social legislation are considerable, and that these have a continuing impact not only on the workers, both unionized and non-union, but upon the total population. Yet at the present time, without wishing to minimize or depreciate the very real influence of the labour movement in Quebec, we must state that this influence is greatly hampered by two considerations that create a tragic situation and demand careful study.

On the one hand, trade-unionism encounters in certain powerful quarters an opposition which, although latent, nevertheless effectively blocks its normal development and prevents orderly union activity at various points in our system of labour relations. On the other hand, despite all appearances, neither in its nature nor in its effect on the economic and social fronts does Quebec trade-unionism emerge as a unified force. The world of organized labour is very much weakened by internal divisions.

I

Trade-unionism is universally considered to be a normal institution in a democratic industrial civilization. It enjoys legislative recognition everywhere and is indispensable to the smooth functioning of labour relations. An outgrowth of the will of the workers, it represents their interests with respect to their employers, to public authority, and to the total population.

Quebec legislation is similar to that found throughout the country. Unions have been established there as long as elsewhere, and have been accustomed to negotiate collective-bargaining agreements. But during

the past decade particularly, organized labour has been meeting systematic opposition. Apparently the great victory won during the 1949 Asbestos strike marked a high point, which subsequently provoked in managerial and governmental circles the suspicion of and tacit resistance to organized labour.

It would be an exaggeration to assert that all management is opposed to trade-unionism. A considerable number of large business enterprises defend their own interests energetically but recognize unconditionally the existence and the function of trade unions. They do not seek to undermine them in any way. The Aluminum Company of Canada, confronted in the summer of 1957 by a four-month strike involving 6,000 workers affiliated with the C.C.C.L., is a typical example. At no time did the company attempt to break the union or dissuade its members from their loyalty to union leaders. The same is true of the Canadian Johns-Manville Company after the famous strike at Asbestos in 1949.

Nevertheless, labour leaders feel that any company in the province of Quebec that is desirous either of preventing the organization of a genuine union or of getting rid of or paralysing the activities of existing unions can always do so despite the laws, thanks to public apathy—and may even do so with the connivance of the government. Certain lawyers and industrial-relations services are recognized as specialists in this type of anti-union activity, and an impressive number of cases can be cited.

An almost infallible and generally recognized procedure for breaking a union has been developed in Quebec. Father Jacques Cousineau has given a description of the technique in *Relations*.[2] The general procedure outlined is as follows. The employer fires the local union leaders, in flagrant violation of the Labour Relations Act. Two possibilities are open to the union: the legal one and the illegal one.

If the union follows the normal legal procedure, it must take action against the employer in the courts. This litigation may drag on for at least a year, and perhaps more, before a judgment is obtained. Then the employer will be condemned under Article 44 of the Labour Relations Act to pay a fine of $100, without, however, being obliged to re-employ the labour leaders who were illegally dismissed. Meanwhile the union has been falling to pieces and by the time it wins its case it no longer exists. The employer has thus eliminated the union by an illegal but peaceful procedure.

A union that does not wish to be destroyed in this fashion must inevitably resort to an immediate strike. But according to the letter of the law such a strike is illegal. This illegality is publicized by the em-

ployer, and public opinion is easily aroused. The Minister of Labour refuses to intervene in the settlement of the dispute on the pretext of not encouraging this illegality. The Labour Relations Board then holds up certification procedure or annuls the union's certification if recognition has already been granted. Legally the union again finds itself in an impasse. Everything is against it. If the union, not having won its case quickly, is obliged to prolong its illegal strike, the provincial police intervene to maintain order and "to protect the rights of non-strikers" who are going back to work or who are taking over the jobs of the regular workers. The employer has thus once again eliminated the union.

An editorial in the January 1957 number of *Relations* showed how the real status of union freedom has been steadily deteriorating since 1944. After recalling that the Quebec Episcopate had, in 1950, insisted on respect for this freedom, the editorial went on to say:

> Since that time there has been no improvement: quite the contrary. It is clear today that only too often intervention by the Minister of Labour (or its absence or delay), and the decisions, whether calculated or logical, of the Labour Relations Board are leading to the practical elimination of union liberties in several geographical and industrial settings in the province (the case of the lumber camps is a classic one and the events at La Chute aux Passes illustrate the crisis) and to the improper protection of labour organizations (frequently those of foreign affiliation as in the Baie-Comeau and Shawinigan areas) whose principal merit consists in their political co-operativeness.
>
> In effect it appears that in Quebec the only union expression permitted is that of the influential, or of the friends of the régime. In matters of union representation the former establish themselves despite employer opposition, legalistic manœuvres, and even police pressure; the latter, after having been encouraged by unscrupulous methods, are established by court action (the Montreal taxi case). But between these two minority groups lies the bulk of the wage-earning population, hungry and thirsty for justice.
>
> A free-enterprise system, which, we are told, is practised and favoured in our province, presupposes freedom of union activity. We should be prouder of our province if all the fundamental liberties flourished there, particularly the effective freedom of the humblest workers to organize themselves in a union of their choice; this would be true union freedom.[3]

The demonstration marches on Murdochville and Quebec, organized by the Q.F.L. and the C.C.C.L. last August and September, had no other intention than to arouse public opinion about a state of affairs which the unions considered scandalous.[4]

Such a situation, even if it is not general, is hardly productive of a climate favourable to the normal development of trade-unionism. It is

indeed largely responsible for the confusion to be found within the labour movement, for the contradictory tactics of the labour leaders, and even for occasional acts of violence that are to be deplored. It is not surprising if some leaders feel at times that only direct political action can produce a remedy. They hesitate, however, to press for this because none of the existing provincial political parties inspires their confidence or offers them suitable guarantees. Moreover, the distribution of constituencies is such that the labour vote is frequently overshadowed by that of the rural population. Furthermore, it does not at present appear that the total union membership is prepared to follow its leaders into the political arena.

The Quebec union movement is developing in the midst of many conflicts. For labour leaders there is no pacific solution in sight. The unions would like to see improvements in labour legislation and in the governmental attitude towards labour relations, but for a long time no attention has been given to their suggestions. So pessimistic is the outlook that some spokesmen are even maintaining that in the present circumstances it is wiser not to press for a revision of labour laws because of the danger that things might get even worse.[5]

In a situation that thus continuously threatens the activities and expansion of trade-unionism, one might naturally expect that the labour movement would be eager to present a common front and form itself into a solid block. For the present, however, except for sporadic outbursts of verbal indignation, this is not so. It must be confessed that the union movement is very much divided.

II

There is nothing new in the fact that the forces of organized labour in Quebec are divided, but these divisions did not in the past have the consequences which attend them at present. Moreover, the noticeable tendency towards the unification of labour power throughout the world, which has brought about the amalgamation of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. in the United States and that of the Trades and Labor Congress and the Canadian Congress of Labour in Canada, is attributable to external causes which are also present in the province of Quebec.

Whereas elsewhere in North America it has been found possible to resolve divergent views and to reach the minimum agreement necessary on the policy-making level to assure a unified front in the face of new needs, in Quebec it has not been possible to reconcile the various atti-

tudes and to discover a formula which would take into account all the unusual aspects of the Quebec union movement. That is why there are still two organizations on the provincial level sharing the union membership, the C.C.C.L. and the Q.F.L. (C.L.C.). In addition to the split into two organizations, which collaborate only from time to time, organized labour is further divided within each of these groups. Certain divisive factors are restricted to either the Q.F.L. or the C.C.C.L. while others are common to both.

Let us first examine the situation within each of these organizations.

The Quebec Federation of Labour appears to be a somewhat artificial grouping. This is in large part owing to its structure. Composed of regional councils at various points in the province, and of locals affiliated to national and international unions, its members have no very close connection with the central organization. The economic interests and the internal structure of these locals incline them much more towards the union of which they are a part, than towards a provincial office which has few services to offer them. Moreover, affiliation with the Q.F.L., although encouraged, remains optional. The organization has no effective control over its affiliated bodies and is even unable to indicate exactly how many workers these include. The latter are free to report whatever membership they wish, according to the number of representatives they want to have at the annual convention.

Between unions whose locals are affiliated with the Q.F.L. there is no contact. Each of them is completely free to organize its affairs as it wishes, to take whatever stand it likes, and to use whatever tactics it considers most effective to serve its immediate interests. Thus it is possible to find in close proximity unions under the thumbs of their employers, others that are conservative, and still others that are very dynamic. Similarly, certain unions have no scruples about stooping to the most abject compromises with politicians, while others denounce violently what they call the government's "anti-union attitude." This dichotomy, one of the features of the old T.L.C., has not altered with the addition of the locals previously belonging to the C.C.L., which, as is well known, have a somewhat different conception of union activity. The second Q.F.L. convention, held last November, showed very clearly that the amalgamation of the two provincial organizations, T.L.C. and C.C.L., had not brought about any magic meeting of minds. On almost all the questions under discussion two sharply divided attitudes emerged. The former president of the Federation of Industrial Unions of Quebec (C.C.L.) was not even included in the executive of the Q.F.L., and cer-

tain resolutions drawn up by the locals, such as those concerning affiliation with the C.C.C.L. and the expulsion of the Minister of Labour from the ranks of the International Association of Machinists, were never called from the agenda.

Since the immediate concern of the officers and members was almost exclusively their own unions rather than the Federation, one is not surprised to observe a tendency towards a certain collective individualism within each union. It must also be noted that in view of the occupations of certain categories of workers many unions have little in common with the mass of Quebec workers.[6] This individualism is accentuated by the fact that the former Q.F.L. (T.L.C.), which embraced the majority of the present Q.F.L. membership, has never given any great attention to the education of members, leaving this responsibility entirely in the hands of the unions.

This absence of organized unity in the Q.F.L., coupled with friction between locals belonging to autonomous unions, places the directors of the Q.F.L. in a precarious position which to some extent explains their capriciousness and inconsistency of attitude. In fact, in contrast to what one finds in the C.C.C.L., none of its leaders is exclusively concerned with watching over the interests of the Q.F.L., since it appoints no permanent officers. They are all much more attached to the unions they represent than to the Federation itself. Their attitudes and their behaviour are affected by the repercussions likely to follow in the organizations on which they depend for their bread and butter. Each of them must be careful not to conflict with the immediate interests of "his" union. He is thus constantly torn between two loyalties. He must adapt to tendencies that, while not necessarily divergent, rarely demand action of identical vigour. Since this dilemma characterizes each of the officers when they meet on the executive of the Q.F.L., they are obliged to avoid clear-cut issues and to restrict themselves to those which represent a common denominator, all of which makes them become in the long run dull and incoherent.

This is the price of maintaining unity and solidarity. As a result, the union leaders fall back on violent talk, which in practice accomplishes very little. Many illustrations might be cited on this subject. We shall select only two.

Certain observers, always on the watch for developments in the labour world, have made much of an apparent change of policy on the part of the president of the Q.F.L. with respect to political action. After the Murdochville episode, when the C.C.C.L. and the Q.F.L. were attempt-

ing to arouse public opinion against what they called a politico-managerial conspiracy, the president of the Q.F.L. in an inflammatory speech declared war on the Duplessis government and laid down a policy of direct and immediate political action. Two months later, the same man at the Q.F.L. annual convention, with the same vehemence, urged the delegates to restrict themselves for the moment to a programme of political education. His decision was approved by the Q.F.L., and we are of the opinion that in this action he was right, because the Q.F.L. membership was not prepared to go any further.

Members of the C.C.C.L. also find it difficult to understand an apparently contradictory attitude in certain groups affiliated with the Q.F.L. on the subject of the utilization of political means in union organization. In January 1957, in the Baie-Comeau area, these groups openly made use of employer and governmental assistance to prevent workers from joining the C.C.C.L. They attempted to break a legitimate strike and opposed a vote on union representation, until finally, on the insistence of the workers and from the pressure of public opinion, the Minister of Labour had to yield and grant a vote. In almost all bargaining units, the C.C.C.L. emerged victorious.

This took place with the approval and complicity of the leaders of the Q.F.L., barely two months before the beginning of the Murdochville incident. And in December 1957, before any action had been taken, even before the Canadian British Aluminum Company factory had begun operations and before the C.C.C.L. had had time to file a request for certification, the Labour Relations Board, after an exceptionally short interval, granted the Sheet Metal Workers International Association union recognition.

Such manœuvres, carried on against a reputable rival group by means of political interference and with employer approval, can be explained only by the organization and composition of the Q.F.L., which give rise to contradictions that can be turned to advantage by certain politicians. That is why, despite their public statements, these politicians do not fear the Q.F.L. as at present constituted. What they fear most is a possible affiliation of the C.C.C.L. with the C.L.C.

It should not be thought that the Q.F.L. possesses no positive features. Quite the contrary. It reflects quite accurately the aspirations and concerns of a substantial segment of Quebec workers, with, of course, their individualistic tendencies, their outbursts of indignation in the face of injustice, their fuzzy thinking, and their lack of collective conscience.

The last Q.F.L. convention, however, adopted a measure which may

in the long run have important consequences in contributing to membership solidarity. This was the creation of a "Union Promotion Fund," or, in other words, a strike fund. Until the present, when members of a local were obliged to resort to a strike, only the union with which they were affiliated gave them financial support. Members of other unions and the Q.F.L. itself were interested only indirectly. The C.C.C.L. has had such a fund for a long time, and each time an affiliated union is on strike, the C.C.C.L. itself is on strike; but when a Q.F.L. union struck, only the Steel Workers, the Machinists, or the Plumbers were involved. There is no doubt that this move on the part of the Q.F.L. will lay the foundations for greater solidarity among the workers, a solidarity which is urgently needed if its action is to be effective. But until such time as the Q.F.L. has the financial resources to pay a team of permanent officers depending upon it alone and not upon individual unions, it is unlikely that logical decisions and executive continuity can be expected. In the meantime, the Q.F.L. will always run the risk of being led or blocked by one or other of its affiliated bodies.

The factors contributing to divisions and weakness in the C.C.C.L. are quite different from those plaguing the Q.F.L. At present these factors are much more apparent than those in the other organization, and if they continue for a few years more they are likely to bring about the gradual disintegration of the C.C.C.L. itself.

In the C.C.C.L., from its establishment to the present, workers have grouped themselves around ideas rather than interests. Not that interests have been excluded, but they have always been considered as a function of ideas. If shared ideas can create unshakable solidarity, the discussion of ideas may also bring about the most hopeless disagreements. What has in the past been the strong feature of an organization that has developed successfully despite the most varied obstacles and has revealed a dynamic character that has permitted it to retain uncontested leadership in the provincial domain is at the present moment the cause of temporary stagnation.

Originally two ideas guided the founders of the C.C.C.L. One of these was religious: the application of the principles of Roman Catholic social doctrine where workers' interests were involved; the other was secular: the freeing of Canadian labour organizations from the control of American unions. The former conception was an original one, whereas the latter was already common to other organizations both in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada.

In order to achieve their ends while conforming to a directive of the Church,[7] the formula established and implemented was that of Roman Catholic unionism. This Roman Catholic unionism had two characteristics: a constitutional conformity to the social doctrine of the Church, and a membership restricted exclusively to Roman Catholics.

With time and experience this formula has been gradually modified: the ranks of the C.C.C.L. have been opened to all workers regardless of their religious convictions, and only the clause relating to the social doctrine of the Church has been retained. Such has been the C.C.C.L. since 1943. This modification has taken place after much discussion but it has been completely accepted by all and today the matter is no longer under discussion. But other problems remain, on which opinion is greatly divided among both officers and members of the unions. These problems can be reduced to three: (*a*) doctrinal orientation, (*b*) organizational reform, and (*c*) affiliation with the C.L.C.

Even though all members are agreed about the value of the principles of the Church's social doctrine and wish to see them applied to labour relations, nonetheless some members wish to adhere to these principles without including them in the constitution, while others wish to affirm them categorically. Is this playing with words, one may ask? Not at all, the antagonists retort.

The first group are convinced that such a modification, which in their opinion makes no essential change, is required in order to remove certain obstacles which block C.C.C.L. expansion in heavy industry and in a city like Montreal, where the working population is increasingly cosmopolitan. For the second group, modification would be a backing down at the very moment when materialism is making great strides everywhere in society, and a betrayal of the founders of the C.C.C.L. The motives which have given birth to a distinctive union movement would be put in the background, and the movement would be effectively killed off. Thus appeals are made for pontifical directives and for an expression of the authority of the bishops of the province, who have traditionally encouraged Roman Catholic unionism.

To this the reply is made that circumstances have changed since 1921. It is now no longer possible to envisage the C.C.C.L. as uniting all the workers of the province. It is furthermore inappropriate at this time to utilize the authority of the Episcopate to dispose of the problem, since the Cardinal Archbishop of Montreal and the Primate of Quebec, who have been consulted on the problem, far from objecting *a priori* to a

re-examination of attitudes, have asked the leaders of the C.C.C.L. to prepare a memorandum on the subject.[8]

Another contentious matter within the C.C.C.L. is the question of organizational reform. This has been under consideration for a number of years in an attempt to give the confederation more cohesion and greater effectiveness. In this realm, too, the principle is accepted but no agreement has been reached on its application.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the C.C.C.L. is organized on a basis which is too decentralized and too democratic. It was established for a membership of 1,000,000, whereas in effect it has only 100,000 members. The central authority is thus deprived of effective power, certain services exist in duplicate, and finally, certain federations are too weak to play a useful rôle.

This therefore is a serious problem for the mere survival of the organization. But in the event of a future affiliation with the C.L.C., the organizational problem must be solved if the identity of the C.C.C.L. is to be preserved. Various projects have been put forward, but one after another have been rejected by the C.C.C.L. membership. There is no doubt that there is here a division between, on the one hand, the traditionalists, and on the other hand, those who are open to compromise. Other considerations also enter. If the idea of Quebec provincial autonomy is so useful in the political domain it is because this idea is an echo of the will of the people. A similar situation obtains within the C.C.C.L. It is a difficult matter to convince local unions and federations who have from the very beginning enjoyed the greatest latitude in the administration of their funds and the selection of their officers that they should give up certain privileges and hand them over to higher organizations. One must also consider the susceptibilities of leaders who play a prominent rôle in their own area or in their own trade. These men are naturally not inclined to favour measures which would subordinate their function to that of a higher authority. Lastly, it must be pointed out that those who are opposed to eventual affiliation with the C.L.C. fear that organizational reforms may hasten its realization.

Affiliation with the C.L.C. is perhaps the most controversial question because all the others can be related to it. Since the last war, there is no doubt that the C.C.C.L. has matured in its organization, its mentality, its recruiting methods, and its attitude to other organizations. It has gradually become a genuine union movement of indisputable vigour and power. It has taken its place in the front rank of the defenders of the

interests of labour against both employers and government. It has to its credit remarkable successes, which it owes to the quality of its leadership and to a cohesion which cannot be found in the Q.F.L., for the latter has no permanent staff at its disposal. The prestige won by the C.C.C.L. received recognition when it began to be prominent in the organizing of workers in heavy industry.

But with the evolution of our economy that has resulted from the increasing interdependence of businesses within the same industry in whatever area, and from the more active rôle which the state has undertaken to play, trade-unionism must, if it is to be effective, adapt its methods, without changing its essential aims. Concentration of economic and political power calls for a concentration of union strength.

Will the C.C.C.L. be able in future to maintain itself, make progress, and continue to render service to the workers if it remains an isolated organization? This is the question which has given rise to so much discussion within the C.C.C.L. over the past three years.

The traditional attitude of this organization has been one of withdrawal into itself, in part as a result of the merciless war which the international unions have waged upon it for a long time. There is not space here to recount the long history of relations between the C.C.C.L. and the other Canadian union organizations,[9] but this rivalry, which has diminished without completely disappearing, has left deep imprints upon its victims and its perpetrators.

Although the C.C.C.L.'s official attitudes on the affiliation question are progressive and discreet, its members are far from being in agreement. At the 1955 convention, the C.C.C.L. voted in principle for labour unity. In 1956 it rejected amalgamation and adopted the principle of affiliation with the C.L.C. on condition that it preserved its identity, that is to say, retained its own characteristics and enjoyed all the privileges of national union status. A committee had been named to discuss with the C.L.C. leaders the implementing of this affiliation. The committee was to present a report to a special convention, which was not held because no agreement could be reached on the problem of organizational reform within the C.C.C.L. When the committee presented its report for adoption at the September 1957 convention, opposition was so strong that the report had to be drastically amended before it was passed by a small majority. Care had to be taken to prevent the principle of affiliation, adopted the previous year, from being completely rejected.

Such is the state of affairs at the moment. The C.C.C.L. executive has its hands tied because certain groups have threatened to withdraw from

the organization if it affiliates, while others will perhaps do the same thing if it does not.

Fundamental to these differences of opinion is a differing conception of the nature, rôle, and future of the C.C.C.L. All are, however, in agreement about the necessity of preserving the identity of the organization. Some believe that affiliation will soon bring about the complete disappearance of the C.C.C.L. They feel that it is better to risk existence outside the C.L.C., even if the confederation has to continue with reduced membership and lose its members employed in heavy industry. They insist upon the difficulties that collaboration with the C.L.C. would involve, citing as evidence certain disloyal practices recently and even presently being carried on by certain of the C.L.C.-affiliated unions. The type of collaboration which they propose is a cartel.

Others, without being unduly optimistic, think affiliation would permit the C.C.C.L. to continue to play a constructive and effective rôle on behalf of all the workers. They think the *status quo* is impossible. It is better to risk working within the larger organization. They do not deny the existence of disloyal practices, but if affiliation does not eliminate them it will probably reduce them. On the provincial front, the C.C.C.L. is likely to increase its influence, because it can count on the sympathy and co-operation of powerful unions including those which were formerly affiliated with the C.C.L.

The champions of affiliation are to be found above all in the unions and federations whose members live in Montreal or work in heavy industry. The opposing point of view is held by those workers whose labour market is strictly local and who do not suffer competition from other parts of the country. Attitudes are also largely determined by the experience of collaboration or rivalry between the two groups at the local level. And it must be noted that the behaviour of certain unions, particularly those formerly affiliated with the T.L.C., is perhaps what spoils things most of all. Certain unions do not conceal their intention of working towards the total disappearance of the C.C.C.L. and of its locals from the Canadian labour scene. They have failed to appreciate the new spirit emanating from the C.L.C. constitution, and from that of the A.F. of L.–C.I.O., in which jurisdictional duality is a fundamental principle.[10]

For the past three years the atmosphere of the annual C.C.C.L. conventions, as well as of federal and regional meetings, has been dominated by these separate but related questions of doctrinal orientation, organizational reform, and affiliation. Much precious time has been lost without much headway being made towards their solution. The effect of

this has been to divert attention from problems of organization and expansion. The C.C.C.L. has remained almost stationary, contenting itself with consolidating its achievements but not moving forward. The apparent solidarity created by the Murdochville affair or by the Aluminum Company strike at Arvida, which was crowned with success after a four-month struggle, was only a temporary lull in a period fraught with dissension.

III

Thus far we have examined the situation within each of the organizations in terms of the particular problems which concern them. Certain problems are common to both. These are reducible to two: membership and leadership.

The rapid expansion of union membership since the war has brought into the union movement a considerable number of new members who have not yet had time to absorb completely the basic philosophy of trade-unionism. Many of them have come in because of union-security clauses. Their loyalty towards the union, although real, does not necessarily give them a full understanding of the purpose and importance of union action beyond the bounds of their immediate jobs. They are ready to support policies which concern demands connected with their trade, but when there is a need for taking a firm and practical stand about union organization itself or about political action, many of them remain indifferent or rely on others to attend to these matters. They are dominated by the prevailing climate of their surroundings and they adopt the behaviour of the remainder of the population.

When a situation develops in which union solidarity is called for in the face of some major danger, as on the occasion of an important strike, they are prepared to contribute financial support, to accept the burden of additional dues, and even to participate in mass demonstrations, but very few are willing to go any further.

It is therefore understandable that on two occasions in the past few years general-strike threats have fallen through. In 1953 after the Louiseville strike, a special meeting of the C.C.C.L. had voted for a general work stoppage as a protest against the crying injustice of a politico-managerial conspiracy. The stoppage never took place. Again in 1957, for the same reasons, the matter was raised in a motion proposed at the Q.F.L. (C.L.C.) convention in connection with the Murdochville affair. In both cases, despite clear-cut declarations on the part of certain leaders of these two provincial organizations, devious means

had to be found to make an honourable retreat and satisfy public opinion. The real reason was that the rank and file of the workers could not be counted on to give effective support to such a move.

The comparatively recent industrialization, the youth of the working class, the lack of collective conscience, the almost complete integration of the individual worker in his own setting, all these explain the weakness of the sense of solidarity. The labouring masses are easily buffeted by external influences that openly or clandestinely enter into collusion against organized labour. In the face of this resistance or even opposition, the whole body of Quebec workers, while remaining faithfully attached to trade-unionism, will not be prepared always to fall in step behind their leaders and to follow their directives, even if they consider them justified and reasonable. There is always in such cases a certain time lag between the assumption of attitudes by the leaders and their adoption by the workers.

Leadership is the other problem common to both organizations. The labour leaders of the Province of Quebec, at whatever level of the organizational pyramid, are on the whole neither better nor worse than those found elsewhere. Some of them are really first-rate men. But because of the special situation in the province, the problems which confront them do not make their work easy. Paradoxical as it may seem, they are in some respects too advanced for the members whom they are leading. They see too clearly and the mass of workers are not able to understand. Their ideas have developed too far for the workers to be able to absorb them. These leaders are sensitive to all matters that concern the collective interests of the working class and they interpret them correctly. But they are greatly restricted in their attempts to serve these interests either because of opposition from without or as a result of a certain indifference among the union members, who are not inclined to move forward from the stage of enthusiastic acquiescence to that of effective collective action.

One would miss the truth if one concluded from this that the leaders are not accepted by the membership or that they impose themselves on the membership by undemocratic methods. On the contrary, their technical ability is recognized and there is no desire to change them. They are re-elected every year and they enjoy complete confidence in their dealings with employers and in their approaches to public authority. But the matter stops there. Is it the fault of the leaders? Is it the fault of the members? Or is it the irresistible pressure of the setting? In any case, one must admit a certain weakness on the part of leadership that fails to arouse the mass of union workers to full understanding of the

vast problems that will confront them as a group in the near future. It is perhaps because the leaders have a slight natural tendency to assume that their reactions are of necessity shared by the members, and because they do not devote to the long and thankless task of education the attention it deserves.

IV

At the conclusion of this study we wish to recall that our intention was not to establish a complete balance sheet of trade-unionism and labour relations in the province of Quebec. To interpret our intention in that sense would be unfair to all who are active in this realm. We have instead sought to underline the critical state in which the labour movement now finds itself.

It would undoubtedly be utopian to expect trade-unionism to develop without creating friction and conflicts. Similarly, it would be illusory to believe that in its internal organization there are no manifestly divergent tendencies. Trade-unionism, as conceived of in our civilization, presupposes democracy as democracy presupposes unionism. Now democracy implies a régime of freedom and discussion, a compromise between divergent interests. It is therefore natural that in the province of Quebec, as elsewhere in Canada, trade-unionism should meet some resistance and should not present a completely unified front.

But when this resistance assumes such proportions that the normal and legitimate conflicts cannot find equitable solutions, there is a great danger that in the long run this resistance may gradually create areas of conflict and give rise to a spirit of revolt that can only lead to class struggle. That is, in our opinion, one of the perils threatening the province of Quebec. If the Quebec union movement is considered as a social institution it must be admitted that, despite its weaknesses and its divisions, despite its fragile cohesion and its internal contradictions, it remains through its groupings and its organization, the secular force which is closest to the people, most likely to appreciate its needs and to understand and formulate its aspirations. It exhibits a dynamic character and a genuine preoccupation with safeguarding civil liberties and with bringing into existence a society which will permit the full development of all human values.

The Quebec labour movement has succeeded in forming an alert *élite*. The crises in leadership and organization are merely temporary. External opposition will ultimately force the labour world to unify itself. It is to

be hoped that the opposition forces will come to realize the need for observing reasonable limits and will appreciate the perils of the policies now being followed, so that our society may be spared the repetition of experiences which have wrought such havoc in other countries.

NOTES

1 Canada, Dept. of Labour, *Labour Organization in Canada* (Ottawa, 1956), 19.

2 *Relations*, no. 200 (August 1957), 208.

3 *Relations*, no. 198 (June 1957), 141–2.

4 See "La Marche sur Murdochville" by Emile Gosselin and "La Marche sur Québec" by André Raynauld, in *Relations industrielles*, vol. XII, no. 4 (October 1957), 382–5.

5 Jacques Archambault, "Les Salariés en face des lois ouvrières," in *Relations industrielles*, vol. XII, no. 4 (October 1957), 365.

6 We have analysed this phenomenon at length in an article entitled "Les Groupements ouvriers dans la province de Québec (1955)," in *Relations industrielles*, vol. XI, no. 7 (December 1955), 10–15.

7 A distinction must be made between a "principle," which is by nature rigorous, and a "directive," which is a matter of discretion and which takes the circumstances into account.

8 This question was discussed in detail during the twelfth Industrial Relations Conference at Laval. The documents may be found in *Le Régionalisme syndical est-il désuet?* (Québec, 1957).

9 See our article, "La CTCC et l'unité syndicale canadienne" published in the special number of the review *Relations industrielles*, vol. XII, no. 1–2 (January–April, 1957), 32–55.

10 Constitution of the C.L.C., Article 2, par. 8; Article 3, secs. 2 and 3.

CULTURE IN QUEBEC TODAY

Jean-Charles Bonenfant

At the outset, it is essential to define precisely the words which in the above title delimit the subject of this article. By "culture" we understand all the manifestations of the life of the mind, but we shall insist on its written manifestations without however limiting ourselves to creative writing, too often considered to be the sole literature worthy of the name. Along with *belles lettres* we shall not forget the arts, nor the social sciences, but we do not feel obliged to discuss the natural sciences despite their great importance, in this age especially. They are in fact more impersonal; they disregard linguistic barriers and are therefore less closely identified with a people's spiritual life.

As for the geographical and political entity known as "Quebec," it is more and more erroneous to think of it simply as French Canada, even if it does constitute French Canada's base and focal point. Let us not forget that almost 14 per cent of the population of Quebec has English as its mother tongue, which is spoken in the home and is its cultural idiom. English Canadians in Quebec possess firmly established institutions, ranging from a well-organized system of elementary education right up to a great university such as McGill, not to mention two other flourishing centres of higher education, the University of Bishop's College and Sir George Williams College.

Quebec has its own English-Canadian writers who are annually eligible to win provincial government awards. Thus it is interesting to note that it was a proponent of English-Canadian culture, Hugh MacLennan, who in 1952 was awarded the top prize for literature given by the government of the province of Quebec for his three works *The Precipice, Each Man's Son*, and *Cross-Country*. The third prize was won by one of the best Canadian poets, A. M. Klein, for *The Rocking Chair*. In short, Quebec contributes its share to the country-wide blossoming of English-Canadian culture.

The converse, unfortunately, is not true. Other provinces have their French element: French Canadians form more than 10 per cent of the population of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and Ontario. They have the merit of having survived as ethnic groups, but have not contributed notably to French-Canadian culture. True, they have produced one of the best French-Canadian writers, Gabrielle Roy, who, although at present living in the province of Quebec, was born and raised in Saint-Boniface, Manitoba, and is a living proof that the French culture of Canada is not confined within the borders of Quebec; it is a fact, nevertheless, that French Canadians in the other provinces, and Franco-Americans as well, look towards the great French province of Canada. The mother in Gabrielle Roy's *Where Nests the Water Hen* expresses this when she says, "Could they even have suspected, in the days when they heard about Frontenac at the Water Hen, that Edmond would one day with his own eyes see *the Citadel of French resistance*."

Under the title of "Culture in Quebec Today," we have chosen to speak of French culture in the province where it has developed especially, without forgetting that French-speaking people can be found throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and even in the United States; indeed the latter has produced the best critic of Canada's French literature, Louis Dantin.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize that in using the word "today" we are limiting ourselves to passing judgment on the last fifteen years only, but this will not prevent us from trying to find historical explanations for present-day cultural manifestations.

This subject of culture in Quebec is rarely treated with objectivity. For years, a number of French Canadians, through a subconscious feeling of belonging to a minority, have felt the need to affirm that, crushed by the material power of surrounding Anglo-Saxons, they themselves at least have triumphed in their spiritual mission. Others, taking the opposite tack, often as a result of discouragement or chagrin, have held in disdain or derided all their compatriots' efforts, bestowing admiration only on whatever came from Paris or from Anglo-Saxon *milieux*. As for those outside Quebec, especially English Canadians, they have generally been oblivious of Canada's French culture or else in order to be kind when the *bonne entente* fever was upon them, have paid it numerous compliments that were both academic and facile. This is moreover only one aspect of the solitude shared by Canada's two cultures.

In reality, the situation of French culture in Quebec is part of the general situation of a group which is after all—and this must never be

forgotten—a small minority not only in Canada but also in North America. Equality between the two races is either a juridical concept fully realized only in the province of Quebec, or else a pious wish forever doomed by demography, geography, and economics. To speak of a Canadian culture with parallel expression in French as well as in English seems in 1958 to be the substance of a dream which is to be found only in official speeches lauding the *bonne entente*. For the moment, we can only hope to search for factors common to the two cultures which, despite a few official demonstrations of friendship, help each other very little. French-Canadian and English-Canadian writers are cordially unaware of each other and are not reticent about affirming that they owe each other nothing at all.

The French of Quebec thus form a minority wrestling with numerous difficulties, obliging them to make efforts which have often been in themselves as glorious as their literary and artistic achievements. Such difficulties have nothing unique about them; often they have much in common with the causes of English-Canadian cultural weaknesses, and their possible removal constitutes a source of hope.

To appreciate the culture of present-day Quebec, certain criteria must be taken into account. Theoretically, the value of a work of art is independent of time and space, and a bad French-Canadian novel will continue to be bad despite the most patriotic motives for admiration. People in our part of the world, however, are rarely inclined to buy for purely artistic or literary reasons. Nevertheless, the writer lives in a geographical and social *milieu* which he cannot disregard. Quebec's culture has its field of action in Canada, in a country born only yesterday to a personal life among the nations, a country which only a few years ago was a colony or was considered a colony by other countries. Its writers, whether they expressed themselves in English or in French, were used to being charitably relegated to the end of the literary histories of those European nations which we call mother countries. This young land of ours, which does not yet possess all the external attributes of sovereignty, can hardly have an indigenous culture, either age-old or full-blown. In reality, it is different from the countries that gave it birth, primarily because it belongs to the New World, but also because it is still too closely related to its European ancestors not to borrow from them—in all fields but more especially in the cultural field—with the attendant danger of copying them in a servile fashion even though the context may be different. Moreover, this adolescent country, lacking a personality, is dwarfed by a giant neighbour which in the world at large enjoys the easy triumphs attendant upon a maturity both rich and flashy.

But to these difficulties, which could be called Canadian since they are shared by English Canadians as well, are added other difficulties more specifically French-Canadian. Poor and relatively few as they were after the Conquest, French-speaking Canadians had to face tasks which were more urgent than the development of a culture. Public instruction was not really established until the middle of the last century, and thus it is astonishing that, as early as 1845, François-Xavier Garneau succeeded in publishing the first volume of his *Histoire du Canada*, and that in 1863 Philippe Aubert de Gaspé wrote *Les Anciens Canadiens*, a historical novel that can still be read with pleasure even by a non-Canadian.

Later, writers began to bring out works in almost every domain, but up to the last few years they have not produced a single work of universal value. French Canada has inspired only one book which has its rightful place in world literature: *Maria Chapdelaine*, whose author, Louis Hémon, unhappily for the glory of French-Canadian culture, was a Frenchman on a short stay in Canada.

One of the primary reasons for the relative weakness of French culture in Quebec was not the absence of a sufficient number of authors—there were many poets, essayists, and critics—but the absence of writers with an adequate education. Of course, the universities had a few priests who were excellent humanists and professors, but these did not pursue the secular joys of imaginative literature. Bohemian journalists, and civil servants with spare time on their hands, did publish very likeable works, but French Canada lacked writers who, having had a solid education, could in some measure devote themselves more easily to creative writing.

Professors making a career out of university teaching were too few in number. It was an important achievement in the middle of the last century for a small ethnic group to create Laval University and later on its Montreal branch, which, in the twentieth century, was to become independent. These universities were primarily schools for practitioners which trained excellent theologians, doctors, and lawyers who, their professional duties accomplished, were able to take an interest themselves in arts and letters, but created nothing which could live after them. Thus it can be considered as a most important and encouraging phenomenon of French-Canadian intellectual life of the last few years that in all domains there has been a considerable increase in the number of career educators who already have produced works enriching the culture of Quebec.

The absence of career men in the early teaching of law, history, and the social sciences was particularly galling when one considers that English-speaking Canadians had been more quick to remedy a similar

situation in their own universities. In French Canada, the situation was such that only a few books—some of them, however, having real merit—were published by writers caught up in tasks foreign to their intellectual aspirations, and who had to compensate by heart-rending improvisation or brilliant intuition for their lack of specialized training. French Canada has produced great lawyers and wise judges, who have carried their brilliance right up to the Supreme Court and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but despite a few unimportant exceptions, these jurists have had neither the wish nor the time to write books, to set forth theories, to construct hypotheses, to further the progress of law rather than interpret it. It is symptomatic that French Canadians, who have so often utilized constitutional law in political struggles, have rarely written on the subject.

In history, whereas the Toronto group had already begun to develop by the end of the nineteenth century, the two principal French-Canadian historians, Sir Thomas Chapais and Canon Lionel Groulx, took up their studies late in life and without any specialized preparation. Even today, the Departments of History at Laval and the University of Montreal are unfortunately not in a position to conduct research, especially on the vital period of the early Confederation era, which can compare with the studies pursued in the majority of English-Canadian universities.

Lastly, sociology, political science, and geography, which contribute as much to cultural life as does creative literature, have long been neglected because there were no scholars who were prepared to devote themselves whole-heartedly and methodically to the study of these important disciplines. In the last few years, both in Montreal and in Quebec, there has been an attempt to make up for lost time, but it is sufficiently revealing that in the final pages of their 1956 *Report* the members of Quebec's Royal Commission of Inquiry on Constitutional Problems wrote:

> We particularly recommend to it [the Provincial Government] that it should encourage, to the fullest possible extent, organization of research in the universities and higher educational centres. This should be done in all branches of knowledge, but particularly in constitutional law, in geography, demography, economy, sociology, pedagogy, psychology, human relations, and, in general, in the sciences of Man.

Only then will cease a situation which was deplored in 1934 by Cardinal Villeneuve in a series of questions which he could afford to ask frankly without being accused of denigrating his compatriots as might a young lad at college or an embittered misfit:

Where is the really personal work that we can offer in competition with the productions of European science, or more particularly in our case, of French thought? Where are our scholars, from whose pronouncements there issue long trails of light? Where are our authors who will have a claim on the attention of posterity? Where are our true masters, in short, the men whose main function is to think? There are a few in each of the university faculties; but if they are counted on the fingers of one hand, there will be fingers to spare.[1]

French Canada has also suffered from the absence of lay teachers in secondary education; it was long controlled by a devoted clergy which had the merits and privileges of pioneers, but which did not feel that its special mission was to further the cause of humane letters, and which, because of its calling, obviously spent more time in proselytizing than in the study of secular literature. As for the primary-school teachers, who were somewhat looked down on by those from the universities and the secondary schools, they formed a unit of their own. They were not always particularly well trained, and often remained strangers to intellectual movements. But even here, the situation is rapidly improving. Barriers are being removed between elementary schools, high schools, and universities. Lay teachers trained by the universities are gradually penetrating further into secondary education, which is itself no longer the particular province of those private institutions known as "collèges classiques," but is already in part administered by the public school system. Thus there is being trained an intellectual *élite* which, along with the career professors in the universities, constitutes a cultural *milieu* necessary to the production, in quality and quantity, of works of the mind.

On the other hand, university *milieux* in French Canada have produced few creative writers. Whereas the English Canadians Hugh MacLennan, Edward A. McCourt, W. S. Hardy, and Earle Birney have taught literature besides writing novels and even poetry, Gabrielle Roy, Roger Lemelin, André Langevin, André Giroux, Jean-Jules Richard, Robert Elie, and Anne Hébert, seem to have nothing in common with university *milieux*, which, at the very most, can lay claim to having only Clément Lockquell and Félix-Antoine Savard. We have almost come to believe that traditional education sterilizes native talent, and that to become a good writer one almost has to be self-educated. It is to be desired, on the contrary, that novelists and poets be trained in the disciplines taught at the university so as to avoid wasteful improvisation, or better, that university men come down from their ivory towers and be able, with all their M.A.'s and Ph.D's, to make contact with reality and

take inspiration from it in the writing of works which their literary training will help them to perfect.

But whether self-taught or a university graduate, a French-Canadian writer remains a prey to numerous difficulties which turn him away from producing works of art. Of French origin, he is lost in an Anglo-Saxon world. If necessary, he could be content to write for pleasure or to find release, but in general a novelist or poet needs to feel the sympathy and comprehension of his public. Vanity, the search after fame, even works commissioned by patrons, can be powerful causes in the development of culture. But a French-Canadian author, when he writes only for his compatriots, is aiming at a small market of readers who are already oriented towards books coming from France, and also, for the greater number, towards English literature, whether its origin is English, American, or Canadian. Moreover, from the commercial as well as the literary angle, it is as hard for a French-Canadian book to succeed in Paris as for a novel or essay of English-Canadian origin to become popular in London or New York. Even at that, obstacles arising out of rivalries among publishers are easier to surmount than those inherent in different levels of intellectual maturity, since there already exist arrangements whereby books from French Canada are also published in France, and the scheme can be improved, especially if worthwhile books are involved.

But the literature of French Canada can with difficulty maintain intimate relations with that of France. Of course, there are eternal themes which can inspire masterpieces independent of time and space, but in general they are subject to the whirligig of literary taste and to a profound evolution determined by history in all its forms. French Canada is no longer in tune with its former mother country France. Wars, revolutions, laws have widened the gulf separating the two cultures. Academic lecturers are obviously exaggerating when they profess to discover in Canada the France of Louis XIV; it is nevertheless certain that a Frenchman may be left cold by a host of dramas which evoke interest or even arouse passionate enthusiasm in a French Canadian. It is not impossible to write a French-Canadian novel of universal appeal, but it is difficult to integrate it with current French literary production. The French-Canadian writer is thus faced with a cruel dilemma especially well known to those who have come back to their country after having lived in French intellectual *milieux*: whether to carry on according to the rhythms of contemporary French literature and thus to withdraw from their country's life and culture, or to write typically French-Canadian novels which would remain outside the main stream of literature written in

French. The true writers are those who have succeeded in conquering this dichotomy and in producing works that have universal appeal while owing their inspiration to French Canada.

This inspiration is very fecund. The French-Canadian writer lives, in fact, in a unique laboratory. To begin with, he is situated at the crossroads of several civilizations, and given a modicum of curiosity he can gather the best that French and English literatures have to offer. For social and historical reasons whose very analysis constitutes a rich reward, French-speaking Canadians, especially those of Quebec, have in the last few years been living through a prodigious adventure. They who had been shut off for years from outside contacts have now been thrust into a rapid industrialization and urbanization which have transformed them and have put their traditional qualities to the test. All this has created innumerable conflicts out of which can come novels and an entire poetic movement, and which can be the source-material of unique historical, sociological, and political studies.

The French-Canadian writer has thus at his command a rich source of inspiration of which in all probability he is not sufficiently aware, or which a certain sense of personal modesty prevents him from utilizing. Desiring to imitate other literatures and especially that of France, he searches for great themes and fails to see the richness of the daily life which surrounds him. Or perhaps he does not possess the capacity for exteriorization which is necessary to the creation of a work of art. He feels unable to sublimate his personal, family, or national dramas. He does not have to cope with official censorship; he enjoys a large measure of freedom of speech; but living as he does in a society restricted in size he feels the full pressure of a social censorship that can easily sterilize him.

This seems particularly true in the religious domain, which should normally be able to furnish French-Canadian literature with works of universal importance. How many French Canadians have found in the novels and personal reminiscences of François Mauriac the atmosphere of family and school which could have been evoked by one of their own compatriots! How many French Canadians have strayed from the religion of their youth and have been content with tedious anti-clericalism when they might have written a work such as Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*![2]

Sterile complaints against culture in French Canada have been heard for a long time; often the imaginary difficulties placed in the way of achieving works of art were nothing but excuses for laziness. Moreover,

we dream too often of masterpieces without realizing that a literature is composed of numerous works of average worth above which there emerge, from time to time, books of exceptional value.

However, though it is all very well to write, it is quite another thing to see one's book in print. There are three kinds of writers: the mediocre ones, as numerous in French as in English Canada, who should not have been able to find a publisher; the fair-to-middling writers, those who constitute the true wealth of a literature since their large numbers create an environment favourable to the emergence of great authors—and who have the greatest difficulty in publishing their works; lastly, the writers of great talent who are successful no matter what odds they have to face. Good French-Canadian writers such as Gabrielle Roy, Roger Lemelin, Germaine Guèvremont, and André Langevin—to name only four of the best novelists—have not had much difficulty, and for them the market has been favourable. To begin with, they have been read in French Canada in the same proportion as good writers anywhere. Their books have sold in France in substantial numbers, and have been translated into English as well. Their writing has perhaps not endowed them with a fortune, but as always with writers everywhere, they have had other occupations which have enabled them to live comfortably. Moreover, with the advent of radio and television these other occupations have become intimately connected with the literary work.

Culture does not find its expression solely through the printed page, as we have tended to believe in the past five centuries. For a long time, it was largely oral, and thus found a wonderful field of expression in the theatre, at a time when many people could not read or owned no books, but made excellent spectators. Thus it can be affirmed that one of the great weaknesses of French-Canadian culture in the past has been the absence of a theatre of real merit, a weakness it shares, moreover, with English-Canadian culture.

In the past twenty years, however, a veritable renaissance has taken place in dramatic interpretation and even creation. Radio and television have created circumstances in which actors as well as writers can make a living while practising and perfecting their art. Radio in twenty years, and television in five, have in their way done more for the development of a culture than many years of purely literary production. Whereas, formerly, the works of Canadian writers were aimed at small groups in large cities and a few cultured people in the country, nowadays even in the outlying parts of Quebec radio and television audiences without restriction can enjoy the artistic creations of their compatriots.

Obviously, the quality of the programmes coming over the air is not always of the highest, but it is a fact that writers such as Roger Lemelin, Germaine Guèvremont, André Giroux, and Robert Choquette have achieved results of high artistic value in observing and giving expression to the reactions of their fellow Canadians. Moreover, certain television dramas written by French Canadians have been on a par with the best films and have thus created an ephemeral film industry which, owing to economic rather than artistic reasons, Quebec could not really afford. Roger Lemelin has even succeeded in composing, in *Les Plouffe*, a television series that both French and English Canadians can enjoy.

Despite the fact that radio and television both help to form an oral culture comparable to that which formerly existed, it is none the less true that the product is short-lived, and authors are obliged to try to please the average audience instead of people of good taste. Of course, there is not necessarily any incompatibility between mass preferences and a work of art, but a writer who wishes to reach as broad an audience as possible is tempted to put aside the controversial subjects, which are often the most fruitful. It must be admitted nevertheless that the creative activity which radio and television have fostered will help to train professional writers who will find an opportunity, in their spare time and perhaps in later life, to write the durable books that a French-Canadian culture must have. Already, television has contributed to the creation of a Canadian drama in French which will be played and, what is more, published.

Culture in Quebec is also expressed through the fine arts, which could be the subject for yet another article. In general, this expression is more impersonal than in literature. Works of fine art cross linguistic and other barriers more easily, and consequently it may be said that in this field there is less of a dual-culture problem than in literature. Outside Canada, French-Canadian painters are as well known as their English counterparts, and their activities and their success loom as large in the pages of *Canadian Art*.

In music, French Canada has furnished up to now more executants than creators, but in this domain—as in drama—radio and television are now offering an outlet which should be propitious to the creation of original works.

In the over-all picture that we have tried to give of the state of culture in contemporary Quebec, we have largely avoided mentioning names and titles, since the *Quarterly*'s "Letters in Canada" has for many years been publishing an annual survey of French-Canadian literature. We have felt

that it would be more useful to stress general characteristics, which are not always brought out in separate book criticisms. Our study may appear severe and pessimistic, but by touching particularly on the source of certain weaknesses which seem destined to disappear, we have at the same time shown some reasons for hope. Naturally, if we compare the culture of French Canada to that of many another country, we find that works of world significance seem rather rare. But it is already astonishing and admirable that a small ethnic group, divorced in time and space from France, the natural source of its intellectual life, and surrounded by Anglo-Saxon culture, should have succeeded in producing works at all, since it possessed little in the way of an *élite*, and that more political and religious than purely intellectual. Nevertheless our university *milieux* seem at present best able to produce an intellectual *élite*; this, however, as elsewhere in the world, may become further and further removed from the populace, which is increasingly influenced by what is least good in American culture. As Professor J.-C. Falardeau of Laval wrote, in 1953,

> The number of those who consciously resist the Americanization of language and thought is constantly increasing: they can be found in university and secondary-school teaching, in the fine arts and letters, on the radio, in journalism. They constitute an advance guard that is more and more lucid and resolved to purify our culture by a more intense osmosis with the civilization of France. But it seems that as this advance guard grows in wisdom and numbers, the distance increases between it and the mass of the population, as though a large pair of shears were at work.[3]

The intensive development of a popular culture which will express itself in all the forms of art, and a perspicacious return to an abundant folklore, may still be capable of slowing down this unhappy dichotomy.

Proponents of French-Canadian culture must remember above all that they are *French*. Obviously their characters can use words of Canadian origin—a French writer does not disdain to use certain provincialisms—but the natural language to use is French, French as it is spoken throughout the world by cultured people.

A French-Canadian language would be a monstrous thing which could only diminish the linguistic field in which writers can recruit readers. Obviously, the fact of writing in French immerses the writer in a great literature in which he runs the risk of foundering, just as the English-Canadian writer is under the spell of the literature of England, but it is to be hoped that one day French-Canadian literature will detach itself from that of the mother country just as American literature has loosed some of its English moorings.

Let us hope then that with the years a Canadian literature written in French will forge closer bonds—at least at the summit—with a Canadian culture whose language is English. They can never merge completely, of course, for apart from language too many essential differences keep them apart. They can at least become acquainted, help each other, or commiserate together over mutual difficulties.

NOTES

1 *Quelques Pierres de doctrine* (Montréal, Ottawa, 1938), 91.

2 This article was already finished when M. Pierre Tisseyre published in the *Devoir* of September 7, 1957, an interesting interview on Canadian literature in French. M. Tisseyre is a Montreal publisher, born in France. The Cercle du Livre de France, which he directs, distributes both French and Canadian books, and offers an annual prize for the best manuscript submitted. M. Tisseyre says that the theme of the *jeune fille* run wild and invariably becoming a *fille-mère*, though it is quite popular in French Canada, no longer holds any interest for Frenchmen. According to him, they are attracted to quite different problems of the flesh.

As for books of genuine religious inspiration, M. Tisseyre has found nothing of value that could be called literature. "Great religious works must be based on a peculiarly vivid authenticity of inspiration, and find a means of expression usually associated with mystics or converts." "Sometimes," he continued, "I receive manuscripts which have a certain dash but no staying power, and sound like an elementary catechism lesson."

3 In *Essais sur le Québec contemporain*, ed. Jean-C. Falardeau (Quebec, 1953).

EDUCATION IN QUEBEC • *Charles Bilodeau*

The educational system of Quebec is one of the distinctive features of the province. In its origins, its philosophy, and its legal and academic organization, it differs in striking fashion from the other North American systems. In no other province, of course, does one find the same differences of race, religion, and language: 82 per cent of the population is French-speaking, 88 per cent is Roman Catholic; the remainder is made up of English-speaking and Protestant elements. This demographic duality is reflected in the school system, the majority of the population having created educational institutions in conformity with its ideals, while leaving the minority entirely free to do the same.

One cannot really know Quebec without having some idea of its school system. This system has evolved slowly over the years and has passed through numerous stages before reaching its present form. In order to understand it, one must first be aware of its historical background, for the past has left many traces upon the present organization.

During the French régime, education in New France, like that in the mother country, was a function of the Church. According to the then prevailing views, the instruction of the population was not the responsibility of the state, but depended upon private initiative, that of families and particularly that of the Church.

Quebec was still a tiny walled town of scarcely 300 inhabitants when the Jesuit missionaries established a primary school for boys there in 1635. This school was soon supplemented by a secondary course of seven years' duration, the curriculum of which was modelled on that of the Jesuit colleges flourishing in France, where the Order trained the *élite* of the country. The principal subjects taught were Latin, Greek, French, rhetoric, science, and philosophy. Subsequently, other courses—hydrography, surveying, law, and theology—were added; in other words, the

more vital university studies were undertaken. Our modern classical colleges, which constitute one stream of secondary education in Quebec and which have trained almost the entire French-Canadian professional class through the years, have in turn modelled their humanistic instruction on that of this first college.

Other schools soon sprang up in the colony. In 1642 the Ursulines opened a girls' school in Quebec. In 1659 Marguerite Bourgeoys established a similar institution in Montreal. A few years later she founded the Congregation of Notre Dame, a religious teaching order destined to become a training ground for teachers, which today numbers 3,500 members dedicated to giving instruction in all ten Canadian provinces.

In the next stage, new schools were gradually set up in the most densely populated parishes. The first colonists came from those French provinces in which education was most widely available, and, as soon as conditions permitted in their adopted country, they asked for schools. We know of the existence of at least 47 elementary schools before the British conquest. The educational situation in the colony was almost comparable to that of France at the period, especially if one takes into account the primitive state of the country, the long and severe winters, and the endless wars.

In 1668 Mgr de Laval, the first bishop, founded just outside the city of Quebec an arts-and-crafts school, in which pupils were taught woodworking, masonry, shoemaking, and agriculture, and from which emerged artists and artisans of unusual ability.

During the French régime, schools were founded and maintained by the clergy and the religious orders. Certain institutions, however, received subsidies from the king and generous benefactions from France. The bishop was the supreme authority in educational matters, no one being allowed to teach without his permission, and his supremacy was acknowledged by the civil power. This close association of Church and education was to characterize all subsequent developments in French Canada.

The disruption caused by the war and the British conquest could not fail to do grave harm to education. Schools were deprived of royal subsidies and of gifts from France; the recruiting of clergy and of members of teaching orders became very difficult or was even strictly forbidden. The Jesuit college was closed and converted into a military barracks, and the Jesuit estates were confiscated. On several occasions French Canadians sought aid for their schools, but in vain. For more than half

a century, the educational situation was lamentable, several generations being deprived of schooling.

In 1801 the Legislative Assembly passed its first School Act by creating the Royal Institute for the Advancement of Learning. This legislation established a body whose members were appointed by the government and who were charged with maintaining a school in each parish and making all teaching appointments. There was no recognition of religious instruction, and, since all authority was centralized in the hands of an Anglo-Protestant executive, the Roman Catholic clergy opposed the Act, which was consequently of very little effect. It nevertheless established the principle, novel at the time, of state aid for education.

In 1824, parish councils were authorized to devote one quarter of their income to education, but since few of them enjoyed sufficient revenue, only a limited number of schools could be opened. The principle of the parish denominational school had, however, been recognized.

A few years later, in 1829, Parliament adopted a further School Act providing for the election of five-man school boards in each parish, the boards to be responsible for school administration and to receive generous grants amounting to 20 per cent of the budget. At this period no European country yet had a public school system which could form a basis for Canadian legislation. The 1829 Act proved effective and within a few years each parish had at least one school; there were 1,202 of these schools by 1836. The Act was a temporary one, however, and, as a result of conflicts between the Assembly and the Legislative Council, the latter refused to renew the legislation in 1836 and the majority of the schools were forced to close.

In the realm of secondary school education, seven new classical colleges were founded by the clergy between 1802 and 1832, to supplement the efforts of the existing schools in Quebec and Montreal.

With the coming of the Union, Parliament adopted a new School Act. In keeping with the attempts being made at this time to assimilate French Canadians, the new Act placed the schools under the control of municipal councils whose officers were for the most part English-speaking Protestants appointed by the government. It provided also for the naming of a Superintendent. Dr. Meilleur, the first holder of this post in Lower Canada, undertook to remedy some of the shortcomings of the legislation. It was the achievement of responsible government, however, which ultimately brought educational autonomy. In 1846 Parliament adopted a new law which freed the school boards from the

municipal councils and which furthermore established the principle of dissent: any group of individuals professing religious beliefs different from those of the majority could constitute a separate school organization. This law is the basis for the present arrangement.

The year 1856 saw the establishment of a Council on Public Education made up of Roman Catholic and Protestant members. It was soon apparent, however, that the mixed membership of the Council created difficulties since many problems concerned the schools of only one group.

Confederation granted to Quebec as well as to the other provinces complete control of educational legislation. A new government having taken power, the Superintendent, M. Chauveau, was invited to form a cabinet. He became Prime Minister and created the post of Minister of Education. When the Cabinet fell in 1875 this portfolio was abolished. The post of Superintendent was restored and the Council was divided into two sections, the Roman Catholic Committee and the Protestant Committee. By this division an idea conceived by the Bishop of Quebec, Mgr Plessis, as far back as 1820, and confirmed by the experience of subsequent years, was implemented. Moreover, the same law named the bishops of the province *ex officio* members of the Roman Catholic Committee. When the two Committees had common matters to settle they met jointly, but in practice the operation of these bodies has been so harmonious that they have met jointly on fewer than a dozen occasions, the last time in 1908.

Other developments over the years should be mentioned: the institution of inspectorships, the setting up of normal schools, the publication of an official educational journal, the founding of Laval University in 1852, and the establishment of several additional classical colleges.

Since 1875 the organization of the school system has undergone no important modification. It has proved to be sufficiently flexible and efficient to adapt to new circumstances. The truth is that it is founded upon a realistic view of the cultural and religious duality of the population and upon the determination of the majority to have French-speaking and Roman Catholic schools. For a considerable period the official educational policy produced only limited results because the plans proposed were judged unacceptable by the bulk of the population or because they revealed serious shortcomings. It was only at Confederation that the province acquired internal autonomy. The majority was then able to provide itself with schools of its choice, and it granted the same privilege to the minority.

Some writers have said that the school system of Quebec was an

extremely original conception. No other country at the time could furnish an example for the leaders of the period, but the logic of the situation could permit of no solution other than that which was adopted. Other countries having a population divided by religion and language have experienced, and indeed still experience, bitter conflicts in educational matters. The fair and completely democratic solution adopted by Quebec has avoided such disagreement and has given each group the opportunity to develop according to its own views.

Let us now examine the present legal organization. The ultimate authority in educational matters is of course the provincial government. There is, properly speaking, no Minister of Education, but the Provincial Secretary, who holds a cabinet post, carries out many of the functions normally attributed to a Minister of Education: he represents educational interests in the Cabinet and before the Legislative Assembly. With the assent of the other ministers and upon government recommendation, he allocates school grants. In pedagogical matters, however, the government has delegated its authority to the Council on Education. In other words, the Provincial Secretary and the Department of Education are concerned with the administration of the School Act, whereas the pedagogical principles governing the actual instruction are the responsibility of the Council.

As we have already indicated, this Council is composed of two Committees, one Roman Catholic, the other Protestant. These Committees, meeting separately, are empowered to regulate the administration of the public schools of their faith, to prescribe texts, to control school curricula, and to supervise normal schools, but their regulations must be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The Committees seek assistance in their work from boards and subcommittees composed of recognized educators and specialists.

The Roman Catholic Committee is composed of the bishops in charge of dioceses, *ex officio*, and an equal number of laymen appointed by the Cabinet. The Protestant Committee is composed of Protestant members equal in number to the lay members on the Roman Catholic Committee, and they too are named by the government. The presence of the bishops adds considerable prestige to the Roman Catholic Committee: all are eminent men who thoroughly understand the school situation in their diocese, and several are in addition experienced educators. Parents are thus assured of a thoughtful and stable educational policy.

The Department itself, directed by a Superintendent, is also divided

into two sections. The Superintendent acts as liaison officer between the Committees and the Cabinet, distributes the grants voted by the Legislature, prepares the annual school budget, receives the reports of school inspectors, approves plans for school construction, and maintains contact with school boards, parents, taxpayers, and teachers. He is assisted in his functions by two secretaries, one Roman Catholic, the other Protestant, who hold the rank of Deputy Minister, and also by numerous other officials. The Department includes many branches: inspection, normal schools, construction, examinations, school grants, research, legal service, family education, and others.

In each district, schools are administered by a school board composed of five members elected in rotation for a three-year term by the taxpayers. The school board has jurisdiction over the location and construction of schools, the levying of the basic tax (the taxable value of property is determined by the municipal council), the appointment of teaching staffs, and school maintenance. The school board itself collects the basic school tax without reference to the local municipal council.

Any number of owners or tenants professing religious beliefs different from those of the majority may either demand the establishment of their own school board, in the case of cities and towns, or proclaim themselves dissentients and form a school board directed by three trustees who have the same powers as a regular school board. In a locality which does not possess a dissenting school, the head of a family belonging to a minority religion may send his children to a school of his faith in a neighbouring municipality, and his taxes are then paid to the school board concerned.

A school board can tax only the property of persons of its own religion. It also taxes corporations, and shares the revenue so obtained with the minority school board, according to the number of resident children between the ages of five and sixteen belonging to each religious group. The revenue from the sales tax which is today imposed in certain localities as the result of special legislation is also divided in the same way. The departmental grants are paid to the Roman Catholic and Protestant school boards in proportion to the numbers of the Roman Catholic and Protestant populations. Pupils who are neither Roman Catholic nor Protestant attend the Protestant schools but are dispensed from religious instruction. The school law is identical for both groups (R.S.Q., 1941, c. 59) but the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Committee each have their own regulations.

The province now has 1,615 Roman Catholic school boards and 271

Protestant boards. Rural Roman Catholic school boards normally correspond to parish divisions. In recent years there has been a tendency in rural areas towards centralization of schools and towards the elimination of ungraded classes, but there has been no establishment of rural school boards in large administrative units such as has taken place in some provinces. The need for this has no doubt been less apparent in Quebec: school areas are generally extensive and include several schools, the province is densely populated, and the demand for public secondary schools is limited, there being numerous private secondary schools.

Such are the principal characteristics of the legal and administrative organization of the school system, a system which reflects the principles adhered to by the majority, as well as the duality of the population. French Canadians almost without exception have always believed that (*a*) schools should be denominational, (*b*) the school is above all an extension of the family, and (*c*) the school must be kept free of politics and must not be subject to the absolute control of the state.

For a Roman Catholic, education and religion are inseparable, education being intended to prepare not only for an earthly life but also for the life to come. Consequently, education is incomplete without religious instruction. Religion, moreover, is not a subject like others for which one or two time-table periods may be set aside. It is necessary that the staff, the teaching, the atmosphere of the school, and the curriculum be impregnated with the Christian spirit, as His Holiness Pius XI reminds us in his Encyclical on the education of youth. It follows that the Church, which has the right to superintend the Christian education of its children, also has the right to supervise religious teaching in the schools.

Another fundamental principle is that education is first and foremost the responsibility of parents. After bringing their children into the world, parents have a duty to educate them and to look after their physical, intellectual, and moral development. From this duty is derived the right of parents in educational matters to give directly or by their representatives the education which they consider appropriate. Roman Catholic parents have also a duty to unite with other parents sharing the same religious beliefs in order to set up schools in conformity with their faith. Only those who hold the same creed can unite in this way; this is one of the principles behind the legislation involving the minority.

Parents delegate their authority in the administration of schools to the school boards, one of whose chief functions is the appointment of teach-

ers, who thus become not state officials but representatives of the parents.

This same right that Roman Catholics demand for themselves they grant to those who do not share their religion. Hence the Protestant minority has complete freedom of education. Every child in the province can thus attend the school of his religion. He can also attend a school conducted in his own language, even though there is no express legislation on this point. Although the majority of Roman Catholics are French-speaking, a number of them are English-speaking. It would have been contrary to the principles proposed by the French Canadians if the minority group did not enjoy complete independence. Thus the English-speaking Roman Catholics have their own schools, which accommodate some 35,000 pupils and which follow a special curriculum prepared by their own representatives and approved by the Roman Catholic Committee.

The state, whose function is to promote the common good, enjoys only secondary rights in education, the rights of the family and the Church having priority. The rôle of the state is not to teach, but to assist the family and the Church in their educational mission and to place the required resources at their disposal. The state may, however, demand of all citizens a minimum of instruction, and it may establish on its own initiative technical schools of all types which would be too expensive for parents to undertake. If a family shows itself negligent or incapable, it becomes the function of the state to provide for the education of the children.

The foregoing are the principles that have guided the Quebec government in educational matters: they are based essentially upon the priority of the family. Moreover, in the light of past experience, legislators have attempted to protect education from harmful political influence. The composition of the Roman Catholic Committee, half of whose members are bishops, assures the elimination of purely political concern on the policy-making level in education.

At the present time the Roman Catholic public school course is twelve years in length. It comprises a seven-year elementary course and a five-year secondary course. The Department holds official examinations at the end of the seventh, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth years.

The elementary course, the curriculum of which was revised in 1948, includes in addition to the usual subjects religious instruction (about three and a half hours per week) and in the French schools English as a second language (from the fifth grade on). Canadian history is taught

from the first grade, and the course for girls also includes from the lowest grades an introduction to household science. Manual-training instruction is also available in a large number of boys' classes. The secondary school course (eighth to twelfth grades), which has just been reorganized, provides for boys the following sections: (*a*) a general course which gives admission to scientific, commercial, and agricultural faculties and to normal schools; (*b*) a commercial section; (*c*) a classical section, available in some areas, with a curriculum like that of the first half of the classical college course established by the Faculties of Arts of Laval and Montreal: at the end of this course the student may continue his studies in a classical college; (*d*) agricultural and industrial sections, which have not yet been completely set up. Of these sections, (*c*) is the most novel.

The curriculum in girls' schools includes in addition a two-year family-life course. In the eighth and ninth grades there is not much specialization and the curriculum provides easy transfers from one course to another. In any one section all subjects are compulsory, but the general section includes courses at different levels depending on whether or not a pupil plans to proceed to university. The prescribed textbooks have all been written by French Canadians.

In addition to the public schools, which are controlled both by school boards and by the Department, there are several other types of school. Thus, some 350 private schools offer a course similar to or differing only slightly from that of the public schools and their pupils are eligible for the official examinations.

There are also Family Institutes, 45 in number, whose course extends from the tenth to the twelfth grades. Preparation for family life is traditional in the education of girls in the province of Quebec. This type of instruction is not designed for purely domestic purposes but is concerned with the whole feminine personality and attempts to develop a feminine *élite* for the homes of the future. The family institutes seek to prepare a girl for her primary function, that of being a wife and mother. Since the rôle of woman is more spiritual than material, the training places strong emphasis on intellectual and moral disciplines. Manual activities retain considerable importance, but they are incorporated into a programme designed to develop fully the feminine personality. These schools are much admired by visitors, who see in them an excellent scheme of feminine education applicable in any surroundings.[1]

It is to be noted that in the public schools training for feminine life also receives special attention. The curriculum for each grade from the first

to the eleventh includes the rudiments of home economics and family education.

The special vocational schools, which have developed on a large scale in recent years, are entirely maintained by the Ministry of Social Welfare and Youth. In the technical schools, of which there are eight, pupils are admitted after their ninth grade and are trained in a technical course for the higher posts in industry. After a preliminary year, students may specialize for three years in one of several branches: machine-shop work, electricity, radio, electronics, mechanical drawing, industrial chemistry, plastics, carpentry, pattern-making, etc.

In addition to the technical schools, there are 38 arts-and-crafts schools offering a two-year course after the seventh grade. There is also the Montreal Trade School (teaching pastry-making, watch-making, millinery, and garment-making), the Trade School for Girls (teaching culinary arts, cutting and sewing, needlework, etc.), schools for automobile mechanics, and the highly specialized schools of furniture-making, graphic arts, textiles, paper-making, and naval training, all of them schools of high repute. There are, furthermore, 21 agricultural schools maintained by the Ministry of Agriculture. Instruction in music and the fine arts comes under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Secretary, and it is probable that no other province does as much as Quebec in this domain.

The training of public school teachers is carried on in the normal schools, to which admission is granted on the completion of the eleventh grade. The courses last from one to four years, according to the certificate sought.

The classical colleges are another type of school peculiar to French Canada. There are 45 of them for boys and 15 for girls, accommodating 28,000 pupils. "If their massive buildings (some bleak and some ornate), including classrooms, gymnasia, libraries, laboratories, college chapels, and residences . . . were concentrated in a single city or on a single campus, they would constitute a more extensive aggregation of academic architecture than the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge."[2] It is probable that there is no country in which one would find so many liberal arts colleges so easy of access.

The classical colleges for boys are maintained by the clergy, those for girls by orders of nuns. They are private institutions, but the boys' colleges receive an annual grant, recently increased to $25,000, from the provincial government, besides occasional capital grants.

These schools follow a programme of study laid down by the Faculty

of Arts of Laval or Montreal, with one of which universities they are affiliated. They are for the most part boarding schools and the fees, including tuition, vary between $450 and $600 per year. These modest fees are made possible by the low salaries which the religious staffs of these schools are willing to accept. The fact that for eight years boys destined for religious or secular life share a common existence explains in part the good relations between Church and state in Quebec.

A pupil enters the classical college at about the age of 12. At the conclusion of his eight-year course, he receives a bachelor's degree granted by one of the two universities. All the pupils who undertake the classical course are preparing themselves for university. The bachelor's degree is of course required by certain provincial bodies such as the Bar, the College of Physicians, and the College of Dental Surgeons, and it is indispensable for admission to the Faculties of Theology, Philosophy, Social Science, and Letters.

For the past three centuries, most of the leaders of French-Canadian life have passed through the classical colleges and bear their mark. These colleges, whose programme in the final four years is approximately equivalent to that of liberal arts colleges in the other provinces, represent a very special conception of the humanities. Faithful to the idea of general culture, they seek to transmit a way of life inspired by classical antiquity, by Christianity, and by French civilization, as well as to provide a rigorous mental training. This general education is based upon the study of languages (French, English, Latin, Greek), sciences, philosophy, and religion. The pupils are thus introduced to all the intellectual disciplines. All subjects are compulsory, but some schools have now made Greek optional and offer an alternative combination of Latin and sciences.

The province possesses three French universities: Laval, Montreal, and Sherbrooke. Laval and Montreal include all faculties; Sherbrooke, founded in 1955, has Faculties of Arts, Law, Commerce, and Science. The French universities are on the same level as the corresponding English-speaking institutions: their principal distinguishing features arise from the nature of the Faculty of Arts, which is composed in part of the classical colleges as explained above, and from their Roman Catholic character.

This account would be incomplete without some mention of contemporary educational problems in Quebec. Education, according to a

statement by the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Constitutional Problems, "is undoubtedly the most important problem which the Province of Quebec must now face" (vol. III, Book I, p. 43). Recommending a special inquiry into this subject, the Commission goes on to say "it would seem to us that no study can answer a greater need of our society in our time" (p. 214). Certain of the great educational problems which are making themselves felt elsewhere also affect Quebec with greater or less acuteness: difficulties in recruiting teaching staff, financing, standards of achievement, and adaptation to contemporary needs. Efforts are being made, however, to find suitable solutions for all these problems and the progress made during the past decade has been remarkable.

Like most other countries, Quebec has experienced since the end of the last war a sudden increase in school enrolment as a result of the increased birth rate and of the rising rate of school attendance. In order to accommodate a wave of new pupils, the province has been obliged to construct hundreds of new schools. In general, school construction in the province has been more than sufficient, the available accommodation having exceeded the needs of the new pupils.

The increase in school population has also made necessary the appointment of new teachers. The shortage of suitably qualified appointees has been felt particularly in remote rural areas, and temporary teaching permits have had to be granted, although perhaps to a lesser extent than elsewhere because of the stability of the religious personnel, which represents one third of the teaching body. The reorganization of normal schools and the raising of admission requirements have not prevented an increased registration such that in June 1957 the number of graduates from normal schools exceeded, for the first time since 1940, the number of new teachers required. The annual surplus of teachers anticipated for future years will gradually reduce the number of unqualified teachers. Improvements in teaching conditions, greater professional qualifications, a higher standard of remuneration, and an expanded professional organization will also raise the status of the teaching profession.

It is on the secondary school level that the problems are most acute. The educational system was established at a time when the province was preponderantly rural and when elementary education was considered sufficient. At that time the clergy undertook secondary and higher education. But today Quebec has become a largely industrial and urban province, and secondary education to Grades 11 or 12 has become essential for most occupations.

New provision must therefore be made in the old organization, new ideas must take their place beside the traditional notions, and secondary education must be made available for all who are capable of receiving it. For a long time only a minority has been able to carry its schooling past the elementary level. Indeed it has been estimated that the classical colleges receive only one quarter of the male population capable of instruction on this level. There are various reasons for this state of affairs: families are large; secondary schools are not numerous; curricula are not sufficiently flexible; and secondary and university education is not completely co-ordinated. Whatever the reasons, the number of secondary school pupils has been relatively small, which explains some deficiencies, among them the shortage of engineers and technicians among French Canadians. The preparation of more students for scientific and economic careers is now one of the urgent needs if the province is to develop. It is an abnormal state of affairs if the school system produces only a fraction of the graduates required.

As we have seen, the present secondary course exists in two separate forms; one public, of five years' duration, often free but leading only to certain university faculties (science, commerce, agriculture, etc.); the other private, of eight years' duration, taught by the classical colleges and comparatively expensive, but giving admission to all faculties. French-speaking parents have not failed to notice that English-Canadian pupils are able to take a secondary course in the public schools at no or almost no charge, and to enter all university faculties, while their own children do not have the same opportunities.

The establishment of central schools in heavily populated areas, a practice that is spreading at present, is making public secondary education more available. The opening of classical sections in certain public schools will allow pupils to cover the first half of the classical course in those schools. With the intention of expanding secondary education, the Tremblay Commission has even recommended the organization of area school boards similar to those in the other provinces.

On the other hand, no over-all plan could neglect the classical colleges, which enjoy considerable prestige and which have for several generations offered secondary education of high quality. It can now be foreseen from the present rate of attendance that twice as many pupils will wish to attend these schools in 1965. Since they derive their income principally from students' fees, these private schools are manifestly incapable of bearing the financial burden involved in new building programmes, and in the recruiting of lay teachers.

To what extent should the state assist private secondary education? Is there any reason for putting public and private secondary schools on the same footing, and if so, what formula can be devised to respect the autonomy of the private schools? These are some of the questions to be answered.

Many of the educational problems of Quebec have an important financial aspect. In order to deal with the post-war situation, the province has had to make an immense effort, and results have been achieved only by the imposition of special taxes: an education fund which has allowed the government to take over school debts and to assume part of the cost of new school construction; a 1 per cent sales tax levied in cities and suburbs; a considerably increased budget for education; the allocation of part of provincial income-tax revenue for education; also extensive borrowings by school boards.

The universities also have large-scale needs. The wave of students who will be knocking at their doors in a few years will require new buildings and additional staff. Already, increases in student fees have had an unfavourable effect on the careers of many students.

The difficulty of educational financing calls for a general financial reform, which in turn raises the problem of the fiscal relations between the federal government and the province. The fact that the federal government collects some three-quarters of the tax income leaves very limited possibilities open to the provincial government and to municipal school and board authorities.

The cultural problem is no less acute than the financial one. French Canadians have always attempted to conserve their national culture and education is a vital means to this end. It is the duty of the school to inculcate in its pupils the elements of French culture and Christian humanism, to implant in them those tendencies of mind and character which are typical of people of the same background, to give them a Christian conception of life and to integrate traditional values with modern thought. The school must stress the heritage of ideas and feelings which French culture represents; it must form a true *élite* of men who are aware of national needs, who are animated by a vigorous public spirit, and who possess qualities of leadership. This transmission of culture must take place despite the frequently adverse influences prevailing in the rest of the continent, and in a world in transition which is seeking its way. Thus the problem is one of very real concern.

Nevertheless, French Canadians are confident of their ability to overcome these difficulties. In the course of their history, have they not always

been able to overcome obstacles and to give their schools a status comparable to that of others? Indeed, in certain respects, in their emphasis upon spiritual values, in freedom of education, in their loyalty to the humanist tradition, in their development of family education, they have made an important contribution to Canadian education.

NOTES

1 A recent book on these schools is *Educating Eve* by Evelyn M. Brown (Montreal, 1957).

2 Watson Kirkconnell and A. S. P. Woodhouse, *The Humanities in Canada* (Ottawa, 1947), 82.